

9382
G9/52

DF214 .G76 1862

vol. 2

Grote, George, 1794-1871.

A history of Greece : from
the earliest period to the
close of the generation
contemporary with Alexander

DOMINICAN
San

ROAD

LIBRARY

LIBRARY

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

HISTORY OF GREECE;

FROM THE

EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE CLOSE OF THE GENERATION
CONTEMPORARY WITH ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

By GEORGE GROTE, F.R.S.,

VICE-CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ;
CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRANCE, AND HON. MEMBER OF THE
IMPERIAL AND ROYAL ACADEMIES OF ST. PETERSBURG, KHARKOFF,
MUNICH, AMSTERDAM, TURIN, BRUSSELS, AND KÖNIGSBURG ;
HON. MEMBER OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF
PHILADELPHIA, U. S. OF AMERICA.

A NEW EDITION.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.—VOL. II.

WITH PORTRAIT, MAPS, AND PLANS.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1862.

PART I.—LEGENDARY GREECE..

Ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῶν γένος, οἳ καλέονται
Ἡμίθεοι πρότερη γενέη.—HESIOD.

938
69152

PART II.—HISTORICAL GREECE.

..... Πόλιες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.—HOMER.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

PART II.—HISTORICAL GREECE.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL GEOGRAPHY AND LIMITS OF GREECE.

	Page		Page
Limits of Greece	1	Views of the ancient philosophers	
Northern boundary of Greece—		on the influence of maritime	
Olympus	<i>ib.</i>	habits and commerce	12
Scardus and Pindus	2	Difference between the land-states	
Their extension and dissemination		and the sea-states in Greece ..	<i>ib.</i>
through Southern Greece and		Effects of the configuration of	
Peloponnesus	3	Greece upon the political rela-	
Ossa and Pelion—to the Cyclades	<i>ib.</i>	tions of the inhabitants	13
Geological features	5	Effects upon their intellectual de-	
Irregularity of the Grecian waters		velopment	14
—rivers dry in summer	6	Mineral productions	16
Frequent marshes and lakes ..	7	Its chief productions	17
Subterranean course of rivers, out		Climate—better and more healthy	
of land-locked basins	<i>ib.</i>	in ancient times than it is now	18
Difficulty of land communication		Great difference between one part	
and transport in Greece	9	of Greece and another	19
Indentations in the line of coast—		Epirots, Macedonians, &c.	<i>ib.</i>
universal accessibility by sea ..	10	Islands in the Ægean	21
Sea communication essential for		Greeks on the coast of Asia Minor	<i>ib.</i>
the islands and colonies	11		

CHAPTER II.

THE HELLENIC PEOPLE GENERALLY, IN THE EARLY HISTORICAL TIMES.

The Hellens generally.—Barbari-		feature of the Hellenic mind—	
ans—the word used as antithesis		began on a small scale	27
to Hellens	22	Amphiktyonies—exclusive religi-	
Hellenic aggregate—how held to-		ous partnerships	28
gether. 1. Fellowship of blood	23	Their beneficial influence in creat-	
2. Common language	<i>ib.</i>	ing sympathies	29
Greek language essentially one		What was called the Amphiktyonic	
with a variety of dialects	24	Council	30
3. Common religious sentiments,		Its twelve constituent members and	
localities, and sacrifices	25	their mutual position	31
Olympic and other sacred games	26	Antiquity of the Council—simplici-	
Habit of common sacrifice an early		ty of the old oath	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER II.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Amphiktyonic meeting originally at Thermopylæ	32	Village residents—numerous in early Greece—many of them coalesced into cities	42
Valuable influence of these Amphiktyonies and festivals in promoting Hellenic union	<i>ib.</i>	Sparta—retained its old village trim even at the height of its power	43
Amphiktyons had the superintendence of the temple of Delphi ..	33	Hellenic aggregate accepted as a primary fact—its pre-existing elements untraceable	<i>ib.</i>
But their interference in Grecian affairs is only rare and occasional	34	Ancient Pelasgians not knowable	45
Many Hellenic states had no participation in it	35	Historical Pelasgians—spoke a barbarous language	<i>ib.</i>
Temple of Delphi	36	Historical Leleges—barbarians in language also	46
Oracles generally—habit of the Greek mind to consult them ..	37	Statements of good witnesses regarding the historical Pelasgians and Leleges are to be admitted, —whether they fit the legendary Pelasgians and Leleges or not	<i>ib.</i>
General analogy of manners among the Greeks	38	Alleged ante-Hellenic colonies from Phœnicia and Egypt—neither verifiable nor probable	48
Political sovereignty attached to each separate city—essential to the Hellenic mind	39	Most ancient Hellas—Græci ..	49
Each city stood to the rest in an international relation	40		
But city government is essential—village residence is looked upon as an inferior scale of living ..	41		

CHAPTER III.

MEMBERS OF THE HELLENIC AGGREGATE, SEPARATELY TAKEN.—GREEKS NORTH OF PELOPONNESUS.

Amphiktyonic races	51	Great power of Thessaly, when in a state of unanimity	62
Non-Amphiktyonic races	<i>ib.</i>	Achæans, Perrhæbi, Magnètes, Malians, Dolopes, &c., all tributaries of the Thessalians, but all Amphiktyonic races	63
First period of Grecian history—from 776-560 B.C.	<i>ib.</i>	Asiatic Magnètes	<i>ib.</i>
Second period—from 560-300 B.C.	52	The Malians	64
Important differences between the two—the first period preparatory and very little known	53	The Cætai.—The Ænians	<i>ib.</i>
Extra-Peloponnesian Greeks (north of Attica) not known at all during the first period	54	Lokrians, Phokians, Dorians ..	65
General sketch of them.—Greeks north of Thermopylæ	55	The Phokians	66
Thessalians and their dependents	<i>ib.</i>	Doris—Dryopes	67
Thessalian character	57	Historical Dryopes	<i>ib.</i>
Condition of the population of Thessaly—a villein race—the Penestæ	59	The Ætolians	68
Who the Penestæ were—doubtful	60	The Akarnanians	69
Quadruple division of Thessaly ..	<i>ib.</i>	Ozolian Lokrians, Ætolians, and Akarnanians, were the rudest of all Greeks	70
Disorderly confederacy of the Thessalian cities	61	The Boeotians	71
		Orchomenus	72
		Cities of Boeotia	<i>ib.</i>
		Confederation of Boeotia	73
		Early legislation of Thebes.—Philoelaus and Dioklès	74

CHAPTER IV.

EARLIEST HISTORICAL VIEW OF PELOPONNESUS.—DORIANS IN ARGOS AND THE NEIGHBOURING CITIES.

	Page		Page
Distribution of Peloponnesus about 450 B.C.	76	Early position of Argos—metropolis of the neighbouring Dorian cities	88
Continuous Dorian states	<i>ib.</i>	Pheidôn the Temenid—king of Argos	89
Western Peloponnesus	77	His claims and projects as representative of Hēraklēs	91
Northern Peloponnesus—Achaia	78	He claims the right of presiding at the Olympic games	<i>ib.</i>
Central region—Arcadia	<i>ib.</i>	Relations of Pisa with Pheidôn, and of Sparta with Elis	<i>ib.</i>
Difference between this distribution and that of 776 B.C.	79	Conflict between Pheidôn and the Spartans, at or about the 8th Olympiad, 748 B.C.	92
Portions of the population which were believed to be indigenous: Arcadians, Kynurians, Achæans	80	Pheidôn the earliest Greek who coined money and determined a scale of weight	93
Immigrant portions—Dorians, Ætolo-Eleians, Dryopes, Triphylians	<i>ib.</i>	Coincidence of the Æginæan scale with the Babylonian	<i>ib.</i>
Legendary account of the Dorian immigration	81	Argos at this time the first state in Peloponnesus	94
Alexandrine chronology from the return of the Herakleids to the first Olympiad	<i>ib.</i>	Her subsequent decline from the relaxation of her confederacy of cities	95
Spartan kings	82	Dorians in the Argolic peninsula—their early commerce with the Dorian islands in the Ægean	96
Herakleid kings of Corinth	<i>ib.</i>	From hence arose the coinage of money, &c. by Pheidôn	97
Argos and the neighbouring Dorians greater than Sparta in 776 B.C.	84	Pheidonian coinage and statical scale—belong originally to Argos, not to Ægina	98
Early settlements of the Dorians at Argos and Corinth—Temenion—Hill of Solygeus	85		
Dorian settlers arrived by sea	<i>ib.</i>		
Early Dorians in Krete	86		
The Dryopians—their settlements formed by sea	<i>ib.</i>		
Dorian settlements in Argos quite distinct from those in Sparta and in Messenia	87		

CHAPTER V.

ÆTOLO-DORIAN IMMIGRATION INTO PELOPONNESUS.—ELIS, LACONIA, AND MESSENIA.

Ætolian immigration into Peloponnesus	99	Messenian kings	103
Dorians of Sparta and Stenyklêrus—accompanying or following them across the Corinthian Gulf	100	Analogous representations in regard to the early proceedings both of Spartans and Messenians	<i>ib.</i>
Settlement at Sparta made by marching along the valleys of the Alpheius and Eurotas	<i>ib.</i>	The kings of Stenyklêrus did not possess all Messenia	104
Causes which favoured the settlement	101	Olympic festival—the early point of union of Spartans, Messenians and Eleians	106
Settlements confined at first to Sparta and Stenyklêrus	<i>ib.</i>	Previous inhabitants of southern Peloponnesus—how far different from the Dorians	107
First view of historical Sparta	102	Doric and Æolic dialect	108

CHAPTER VI.

LAWS AND DISCIPLINE OF LYKURGUS AT SPARTA.

	Page		Page
Lykurgus—authorities of Plutarch respecting him	110	Special meaning of the word Periœki in Laconia	134
Uncertainties about his genealogy ..	<i>ib.</i>	Statement of Isokratês as to the origin of the Periœki	135
Probable date of Lykurgus	111	Statement of Ephorus—different from Isokratês, yet not wholly irreconcilable	136
Opinion of O. Müller (that Sparta is the perfect type of Dorian character and tendencies) is incorrect. Peculiarity of Sparta ..	113	Spartans and Periœki—no distinction of race known between them in historical times	138
Early date of Lykurgus	114	3. Helots—essentially villagers ..	140
View taken of Lykurgus by Herodotus	<i>ib.</i>	They were serfs—adscripti glebæ—their condition and treatment ..	<i>ib.</i>
Little said about Lykurgus in the earlier authors	115	Bravery and energy of the Helots—fear and cruelty of the Spartans	142
Copious details of Plutarch	<i>ib.</i>	Evidence of the character of the Spartan government	143
Regency of Lykurgus—his long absence from Sparta	<i>ib.</i>	The Krypteia	<i>ib.</i>
He is sent by the Delphian oracle to reform the state	116	Manumitted Helots	144
His institutions ascribed to him—senate and popular assembly—ephors	<i>ib.</i>	Economical and social regulations ascribed to Lykurgus	145
Constitution ascribed to Lykurgus agrees with that which we find in Homer	119	Partition of lands	<i>ib.</i>
Pair of kings at Sparta—their constant dissensions—a security to the state against despotism ..	<i>ib.</i>	Syssitia or public mess	146
Idea of Kleomenês III. respecting the first appointment of the ephors	120	Public training or discipline ..	<i>ib.</i>
Popular origin of the board of ephors—oath interchanged between them and the kings ..	121	Manners and training of the Spartan women—opinion of Aristotle	148
Subordination of the kings, and supremacy of the ephors, during the historical times	122	Statement of Xenophon and Plutarch	149
Position and privileges of the kings	123	Number of rich women in the time of Aristotle—they had probably procured exemption from the general training	151
Power of the ephors	124	Earnest and lofty patriotism of the Spartan women	152
Public assembly	126	Lykurgus is the trainer of a military brotherhood more than the framer of a political constitution ..	153
The Senate	127	His end, exclusively warlike—his means, exclusively severe	155
Spartan constitution—a close oligarchy	<i>ib.</i>	Statements of Plutarch about Lykurgus—much romance in them ..	156
Long duration of the constitution without formal change—one cause of the respect in Greece and pride in the Spartans themselves	128	New partition of lands—no such measure ascribed to Lykurgus by earlier authors down to Aristotle	<i>ib.</i>
Dorians divided into three tribes—Hylleis, Pamphyli, and Dymanes	129	The idea of Lykurgus as an equal partitioner of lands belongs to the century of Agis and Kleomenês	159
Local distinctions known among the Spartans	130	Circumstances of Sparta down to the reign of Agis	160
Population of Laconia—1. Spartans	131	Diminished number of citizens and degradation of Sparta in the reign of Agis. His ardent wish	
2. Periœki	132		

CHAPTER VI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
to restore the dignity of the state	161	Nor were there any laws which tended to equalise it.. .. .	169
Historic fancy of Lykurgus as an equal partitioner of lands grew out of this feeling	162	Opinions of Aristotle	170
Partition proposed by Agis	163	Erroneous suppositions with regard to the Spartan law and practice of succession	<i>ib.</i>
Opinion that Lykurgus proposed some agrarian interference, but not an entire repartition, gratuitous and improbable	<i>ib.</i>	Lykurgian system—originally applied only to Sparta—introduced equal severity of discipline, not equality of property	175
The statement of Plutarch is best explained by supposing it a fiction of the time of Agis	165	Original Dorian allotment of land in Sparta unknown—probably not equal	176
Acknowledged difficulty of understanding by what means the fixed number and integrity of the lots were maintained	167	Gradual conquest of Laconia, the result of the new force imparted by the Lykurgian discipline	<i>ib.</i>
Plutarch's story about the ephor Epitadeus	<i>ib.</i>	Conquest of Amyklæ, Pharis and Geronthræ, by king Tëleklus	178
Landed property was always unequally divided at Sparta.. .. .	168	Helus conquered by Alkamenês	179
		Progressive increase of Sparta	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER VII.

FIRST AND SECOND MESSENIAN WARS.

Authorities for the history of the Messenian wars.. .. .	180	war—the Messenians again conquered	186
Chiefly belong to the time after the foundation of Messênê by Epameinondas	181	Narrative of Pausanias, borrowed from the poet Rhianus, is undeserving of credit	187
Absence of real or ancient traditions concerning these wars: contradictions about the Messenian hero Aristomenês	182	The poet Tyrtæus, the ally of Sparta—his great efficiency and influence over the Spartan mind	188
Dates of the first wars—B.C. 743-724	<i>ib.</i>	Musical susceptibilities of the Spartans	189
Causes alleged by the Spartans	<i>ib.</i>	Powerful ethical effect of the old Grecian music	190
Spartan king Tëleklus slain by the Messenians at the temple of Artemis Limnatis	183	Sufferings of the Spartans in the second Messenian war	191
First Messenian war	184	Date of the second war, B.C. 648-631	193
Messenian kings, Euphaês and Aristodêmus	<i>ib.</i>	Punishment of the traitor Aristokratês, king of the Arcadian Orchomenus	<i>ib.</i>
Messenians concentrate themselves on Mount Ithômê—after a long siege they are completely conquered	185	Spartans acquire the country west of Taygetus	194
Harsh treatment and Helotism of the conquered Messenians under Sparta	<i>ib.</i>	The Messenian Dorians had no considerable fortified places—lived in small townships and villages	195
Revolt of the Messenians against Sparta—second Messenian war—Aristomenês	186	Relations of Pisa and Elis	<i>ib.</i>
His chivalrous exploits and narrow escapes—end of the second		Struggles of the Pisatæ and Triphyliaus for autonomy.—The latter in after-times sustained by the political interests of Sparta	196

CHAPTER VIII.

CONQUESTS OF SPARTA TOWARDS ARCADIA AND ARGOLIS.

	Page		Page
State of Arcadia	198	portion of Peloponnesus, from sea to sea, by the Spartans, before 540 B.C.	207
Tegea and Mantinea the most powerful Arcadian towns before the building of Megalopolis ..	200	Great comparative power of Sparta at that early time	208
Encroachments of Sparta upon the southern boundary of Arcadia ..	201	Careful personal training of the Spartans—at a time when other states had no training at all ..	209
Unsuccessful attempts of the Spartans against Tegea	202	Military institutions of Sparta—Peculiar and minute military subdivisions, distinct from the civil—Enômoties, &c.	210
They are directed by the oracle to bring to Sparta the bones of the hero Orestês	203	Careful drilling of the Enômoties ..	212
Their operations against Tegea become more successful; nevertheless Tegea maintains her independence	204	In other Grecian cities there were no peculiar military divisions distinct from the civil	214
Boundaries of Sparta towards Argos—conquest of Thyreâtis by Sparta	<i>ib.</i>	Recognised superiority of Sparta—a part of early Grecian sentiment—coincident with the growing tendency to increased communion	215
Battle of the 300 select champions, between Sparta and Argos, to decide the possession of the Thyreatis—valour of Othryades ..	205	Homeric mode of fighting—probably belonged to Asia, not to Greece	<i>ib.</i>
Thyreâtis comes into possession of Sparta—efforts of the Argeians to recover it	<i>ib.</i>	Argos—her struggles to recover the headship of Greece	216
Alteration in Grecian opinion, as to the practice of deciding disputes by select champions ..	206	Her conquest of Mykenæ, Tiryns, and Kleônæ.—Nemean games ..	217
Kynurians in Argolis—said to be of Ionic race, but dorisèd ..	207	Achaia—twelve autonomous towns, perhaps more—little known ..	218
Full acquisition of the southern			

CHAPTER IX.

CORINTH, SIKYON, AND MEGARA.—AGE OF THE GRECIAN DESPOTS.

Early commerce and enterprise of the Corinthians	220	Such change indicates an advance in the Greek mind	233
Oligarchy of the Bacchiadæ ..	221	Dissatisfaction with the oligarchies—modes by which the despots acquired power	234
Early condition of Megara	222	Examples	236
Early condition of Sikyôn	222	Tendency towards a better organised citizenship	<i>ib.</i>
Rise of the despots	<i>ib.</i>	Character and working of the despots	237
Earliest changes of government in Greece	223	The demagogue-despot of the earlier times compared with the demagogue of later times ..	238
Peculiarity of Sparta	224	Contrast between the despot and the early heroic king. Position of the despot	239
Discontinuance of kingship in Greece generally	225	Good government impossible to him	240
Comparison with the middle ages of Europe	226		
Anti-monarchical sentiment of Greece—Mr. Mitford	229		
Causes which led to the growth of that sentiment	231		
Change to oligarchical government ..	232		

CHAPTER IX.—*continued*.

	Page		Page
Conflict between oligarchy and despotism preceded that between oligarchy and democracy	243	Dynasty of despots at Sikyôn—the Orthagoridæ	246
Early oligarchies included a multiplicity of different sections and associations	244	Violent proceedings of Kleisthenês	247
Government of the Geomori—a close order of present or past proprietors	<i>ib.</i>	Classes of the Sikyonian population	249
Classes of the people	245	Fall of the Orthagoridæ—state of Sikyôn after it.. .. .	250
Military force of the early oligarchies consisted of cavalry ..	<i>ib.</i>	The Sikyonian despots not put down by Sparta	251
Rise of the heavy-armed infantry and of the free military marine—both unfavourable to oligarchy	246	Despots at Corinth—Kypselus ..	253
Dorian states—Dorian and non-Dorian inhabitants	<i>ib.</i>	Periander	254
		Great power of Corinth under Periander	255
		Fall of the Kypselid dynasty ..	256
		Megara—Theagenês the despot ..	<i>ib.</i>
		Disturbed government at Megara—The poet Theognis	257
		Analogy of Corinth, Sikyôn and Megara	259

CHAPTER X.

IONIC PORTION OF HELLAS.—ATHENS BEFORE SOLON.

History of Athens before Drako—only a list of names	260	revolution of Kleisthenês became extra-political	276
No king after Kodrus. Life archons. Decennial archons. Annual archons, nine in number	<i>ib.</i>	Many distinct political communities originally in Athens.—Theseus	277
Archonship of Kreôn, B.C. 683—commencement of Attic chronology	261	Long continuance of the cantonal feeling	278
Obscurity of the civil condition of Attica before Solon	<i>ib.</i>	What demes were originally independent of Athens.—Eleusis ..	279
Alleged duodecimal division of Attica in early times	262	Eupatridæ, Geômori, and Demiurgi	280
Four Ionic tribes—Geleontes, Hoplêtes, Ægikoreis, Argadeis ..	<i>ib.</i>	Eupatridæ originally held all political power	<i>ib.</i>
These not names of castes or professions	263	Senate of Areopagus	281
Component portions of the four tribes	264	The nine archons—their functions	282
The Trittys and the Naukrary ..	<i>ib.</i>	Drako and his laws	283
The Phratry and the Gens	265	Different tribunals for homicide at Athens	284
What constituted the gens or gentile communion	266	Regulations of Drako about the Ephetæ	286
Artificial enlargement of the primitive family association. Ideas of worship and ancestry coalesce	268	Local superstitions at Athens about trial of homicide	287
Belief in a common divine ancestor	269	Attempted usurpation by Kylôn	289
This ancestry fabulous, yet still accredited	<i>ib.</i>	His failure, and massacre of his partisans by order of the Alkmæonids	290
Analogies from other nations ..	270	Trial and condemnation of the Alkmæonids	<i>ib.</i>
Roman and Grecian gentes	274	Pestilence and suffering at Athens	291
Rights and obligations of the gentile and phratric brethren ..	<i>ib.</i>	Mystic sects and brotherhoods in the sixth century B.C. Epimenidês of Krete	292
The gens and phratry after the		Epimenidês visits and purifies Athens	293
		His life and character	<i>ib.</i>
		Contrast of his age with that of Plato	294

CHAPTER XI.

SOLONIAN LAWS AND CONSTITUTION.

	Page		Page
Life, character, and poems of Solon	296	powers only in assembly—chose	
War between Athens and Megara		magistrates and held them to	
about Salamis	297	accountability	322
Acquisition of Salamis by Athens	298	Pro-bouleutic or pre-considering	
Settlement of the dispute by Spartan		Senate of Four Hundred	<i>ib.</i>
arbitration in favour of Athens	299	Senate of Areopagus—its powers	
State of Athens immediately before		enlarged	323
the legislation of Solon	300	Confusion frequently seen between	
Internal dissension—misery of the		Solonian and post-Solonian insti-	
poorer population	<i>ib.</i>	tutions	<i>ib.</i>
Slavery of the debtors—law of		Loose language of the Athenian	
debtor and creditor	301	orators on this point	<i>ib.</i>
Injustice and rapacity of the rich	302	Solon never contemplated the future	
General mutiny and necessity for		change or revision of his	
a large reform	303	own laws	325
Solon made archon, and invested		Solon laid the foundation of the	
with full powers of legislation . .	<i>ib.</i>	Athenian democracy, but his insti-	
He refuses to make himself despot	<i>ib.</i>	tutions are not democratical	326
His Seisachtheia, or relief-law for		The real Athenian democracy begins	
the poorer debtors	304	with Kleisthenēs	327
Debasement of the money-standard	305	Athenian government after Solon	
General popularity of the measure		still oligarchical, but mitigated	328
after partial dissatisfaction . .	307	The archons still continued to be	
Different statements afterwards as		judges until after the time of	
to the nature and extent of the		Kleisthenēs	329
Seisachtheia	<i>ib.</i>	After-changes in the Athenian	
Necessity of the measure—mischievous		constitution overlooked by the	
contracts to which the		orators, but understood by Aristot-	
previous law had given rise . .	308	le, and strongly felt at Athens	
Solon's law finally settled the ques-		during the time of Periklēs . .	330
tion—no subsequent complaint		Gentes and Phratrises under the	
as to private debts—respect for		Solonian constitution—status of	
contracts unbroken under the		persons not included in them . .	331
democracy	310	Laws of Solon	332
Distinction made in an early society		The Draconian laws about homicide	
between the principal and the		retained; the rest abrogated . .	333
interest of a loan—interest dis-		Multifarious character of the laws	
approved of <i>in toto</i>	311	of Solon: no appearance of clas-	
This opinion was retained by the		sification	<i>ib.</i>
philosophers, after it had ceased		He prohibits the export of landed	
to prevail in the community		produce from Attica, except oil	334
generally	315	The prohibition of little or no	
Solonian Seisachtheia never imi-		effect	335
tated at Athens—money-standard		Encouragement to artisans and	
honestly maintained after-		industry	<i>ib.</i>
wards	317	Power of testamentary bequest—	
Solon is empowered to modify the		first sanctioned by Solon	336
political constitution	318	Laws relating to women	337
His census—four scales of prop-		Regulations about funerals	338
erty	319	About evil-speaking and abusive	
Graduated liability to income-tax,		language	339
of the three richest classes, one		Rewards to the victors at the	
compared with the other	320	sacred games	<i>ib.</i>
Admeasurement of political rights		Theft	340
and franchises according to this		Censure pronounced by Solon upon	
scale—a timocracy	321	citizens neutral in a sedition . .	341
Fourth or poorest class—exercised			

CHAPTER XI.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Necessity under the Grecian city-governments, of some positive sentiment on the part of the citizens	342	Moral lesson arising out of the narrative	349
Contrast in this respect between the age of Solon and the subsequent democracy	<i>ib.</i>	State of Attica after the Solonian legislation	<i>ib.</i>
The same idea followed out in the subsequent Ostracism	343	Return of Solon to Athens	<i>ib.</i>
Sentiment of Solon towards the Homeric poems and the drama	<i>ib.</i>	Rise of Peisistratus	350
Difficulties of Solon after the enactment of the laws. He retires from Attica	344	His memorable stratagem to procure a guard from the people	351
Visits Egypt and Cyprus	345	Peisistratus seizes the Akropolis and becomes despot—courageous resistance of Solon	<i>ib.</i>
Alleged interview and conversation of Solon with Croesus at Sardis	<i>ib.</i>	Death of Solon—his character	352
		Appendix, on the procedure of the Roman law respecting principal and interest in a loan of money	354

CHAPTER XII.

EUBŒA.—CYCLADES.

The islands called Cyclades	358	Homeric hymn to the Delian Apollo—evidence as to early Ionic life	363
Eubœa	<i>ib.</i>	War between Chalkis and Eretria in early times—extensive alliances of each	364
Its six or seven towns—Chalkis, Eretria, &c.	359	Commerce and colonies of Chalkis and Eretria—Euboic scale of money and weight	365
How peopled	360	Three different Grecian scales—Æginaean, Euboic, and Attic—their ratio to each other	<i>ib.</i>
Early power of Chalkis, Eretria, Naxos, &c.	<i>ib.</i>		
Early Ionic festival at Dêlos; crowded and wealthy	362		
Its decline about 560 B.C.—causes thereof	363		

CHAPTER XIII.

ASIATIC IONIANS.

Twelve Ionic cities in Asia	366	Worship of Apollo and Artemis—existed on the Asiatic coast prior to the Greek immigrants—adopted by them	370
Legendary event called the Ionic migration	<i>ib.</i>	Pan-Ionic festival and Amphiktyony on the promontory of Mykalê	<i>ib.</i>
Emigrants to these cities—diverse Greeks	<i>ib.</i>	Situation of Milêtus—of the other Ionic cities	371
Great differences of dialect among the twelve cities	368	Territories interspersed with Asiatic villages	372
Ionic cities really founded by different migrations	<i>ib.</i>	Magnêsia on the Mæander—Magnêsia on Mount Sipylus	<i>ib.</i>
Consequences of the mixture of inhabitants in these colonies—more activity—more instability	<i>ib.</i>	Ephesus—Androklos the Ækist—first settlement and distribution	373
Mobility ascribed to the Ionic race as compared with the Doric—arises from this cause	369	Increase and acquisitions of Ephesus	374
Ionic cities in Asia—mixed with indigenous inhabitants	<i>ib.</i>		

SAN RAFAEL,

MARIN COUNTY

CHAPTER XIII.—*continued*.

	Page		Page
Kolophôn, its origin and history	375	Internal distribution of the inhabitants of Teôs	377
Temple of Apollo at Klarus, near Kolophôn—its legends	376	Erythræ and Chios	378
Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, &c.	377	Klazomenæ—Phôkæa	379
		Smyrna	380

CHAPTER XIV.

ÆOLIC GREEKS IN ASIA.

Twelve cities of Æolic Greeks ..	382	Ante-Hellenic inhabitants in the region of Mount Ida—Mysians and Teukrians	387*
Their situation—eleven near together on the Elæitic Gulf ..	<i>ib.</i>	Teukrians of Gergis	388
Legendary Æolic migration ..	383	Mitylênê—its political dissensions—its poets	<i>ib.</i>
Kymô—the earliest as well as the most powerful of the twelve ..	<i>ib.</i>	Power and merit of Pittakus ..	389
Magnêsia ad Sipylum	384	Alkæus the poet—his flight from battle	<i>ib.</i>
Lesbos	385	Bitter opposition of Pittakus and Alkæus in internal politics ..	390
Early inhabitants of Lesbos before the Æolians	<i>ib.</i>	Pittakus is created Æsymnete, or Dictator of Mitylênê	<i>ib.</i>
Æolic establishments in the region of Mount Ida	386		
Continental settlements of Lesbos and Tenedos	387		

CHAPTER XV.

ASIATIC DORIANS.

Asiatic Dorians—their Hexapolis	392	Exclusion of Halikarnassus from the Hexapolis	393
Other Dorians, not included in the Hexapolis	393		

CHAPTER XVI.

NATIVES OF ASIA MINOR WITH WHOM THE GREEKS BECAME CONNECTED.

Indigenous nations of Asia Minor—Homeric geography	394	Partial identity of legends	399
Features of the country	395	Phrygians	400
Names and situations of the different people	<i>ib.</i>	Their influence upon the early Greek colonists	401
Not originally aggregated into large kingdoms or cities	396	Greek musical scale—partly borrowed from the Phrygians ..	402
River Halys—the ethnographical boundary. Syro-Arabians eastward of that river	<i>ib.</i>	Phrygian music and worship among the Greeks in Asia Minor ..	403
Thracian race—in the north of Asia Minor	397	Character of Phrygians, Lydians, and Mysians	404
Ethnical affinities and migrations	398	Primitive Phrygian king or hero Gordius	406
		Midas	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XVII.

LYDIANS.—MEDES.—CIMMERIANS.—SCYTHIANS.

	Page		Page
Lydians—their music and instruments	407	Invasion of Asia by Scythians and Cimmerians	428
They and their capital Sardis unknown to Homer	<i>ib.</i>	Cimmerians driven out of their country by the Scythians ..	429
Early Lydian kings	408	Difficulties in the narrative of Herodotus	430
Kandaülés and Gygês	<i>ib.</i>	Cimmerians in Asia Minor ..	431
The Mermnad dynasty succeeds to the Herakleid	409	Scythians in Upper Asia ..	434
Legend of Gygês in Plato	<i>ib.</i>	Expulsion of these Nomads, after a temporary occupation ..	435
Feminine influence running through the legends of Asia Minor ..	<i>ib.</i>	Lydian kings Sadyattês and Alyattês—war against Milêtus ..	436
Distribution of Lydia into two parts—Lydia and Torrnhêbia ..	410	Sacrilege committed by Alyattês—oracle—he makes peace with Milêtus	437
Proceedings of Gygês	<i>ib.</i>	Long reign—death—and sepulchre of Alyattês	<i>ib.</i>
His son and successor Ardys ..	411	Crœsus	438
Assyrians and Medes	<i>ib.</i>	He attacks and conquers the Asiatic Greeks	<i>ib.</i>
First Median king—Dêiokês ..	414	Want of coöperation among the Ionic cities	439
His history composed of Grecian materials, not Oriental	415	Unavailing suggestion of Thalês—to merge the twelve Ionic cities into one Pan-Ionic city at Teôs	<i>ib.</i>
Phraortês—Kyaxarês	416	Capture of Ephesus	440
Siege of Nineveh—invasion of the Scythians and Cimmerians ..	419	Crœsus becomes king of all Asia westward of the Halys	441
The Cimmerians	<i>ib.</i>	New and important era for the Hellenic world—commencing with the conquests of Crœsus ..	<i>ib.</i>
The Scythians	<i>ib.</i>	Action of the Lydian empire continued on a still larger scale by the Persians	442
Grecian settlements on the coast of the Euxine	420		
Scythia as described by Herodotus	421		
Tribes of Scythians	422		
Manners and worship	423		
Scythians formidable from numbers and courage	425		
Sarmatians	426		
Tribes east and north of the Palus Mæotis	<i>ib.</i>		
Tauri in the Crimea—Massagetæ ..	428		

CHAPTER XVIII.

PHENICIANS.

Phenicians and Assyrians—members of the Semitic family of the human race	444	Productive region round Gadês, called Tartêssus	452
Early presence of Phenician ships in the Grecian seas—in the Homeric times	445	Phenicians and Carthaginians—the establishments of the latter combined views of empire with views of commerce	453
Situation and cities of Phenicia ..	<i>ib.</i>	Phenicians and Greeks in Sicily and Cyprus—the latter partially supplant the former	454
Phenician commerce flourished more in the earlier than in the later times of Greece	449	Iberia and Tartêssus—unvisited by the Greeks before about 630 B.C.	455
Phenician colonies—Utica, Carthage, Gadês, &c.	<i>ib.</i>	Memorable voyage of the Samian Kolæus to Tartêssus	456
Commerce of the Phenicians of Gadês—towards Africa on one side and Britain on the other ..	451	Exploring voyages of the Phœkæans, between 630-570 B.C. ..	457

CHAPTER XVIII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Important addition to Grecian geographical knowledge, and stimulus to Grecian fancy, thus communicated	458	This circumnavigation was really accomplished—doubts of critics, ancient and modern, examined	460
Circumnavigation of Africa by the Phenicians	459	Caravan-trade by land carried on by the Phenicians	465

CHAPTER XIX.

ASSYRIANS.—BABYLON.

Assyrians—their name rests chiefly on Nineveh and Babylon	466	Immense command of human labour possessed by the Babylonian kings	475
Chaldæans at Babylon—order of priests	467	Collective civilization in Asia, without individual freedom or development	476
Their astronomical observations	<i>ib.</i>	Graduated contrast between Egyptians, Assyrians, Phenicians, and Greeks	<i>ib.</i>
Babylonia—its laborious cultivation and fertility	469	Deserts and predatory tribes surrounding the Babylonians ..	477
City of Babylon—its dimensions and walls	470	Appendix, 'Nineveh and its Remains,' by Mr. Layard	478
Babylon—only known during the time of its degradation—yet even then the first city in Western Asia	474		

CHAPTER XX.

EGYPTIANS.

Phenicians—the link of commerce between Egypt and Assyria ..	480	First introduction of Greeks into Egypt under Psammetichus—stories connected with it ..	494
Herodotus—earliest Grecian informant about Egypt	<i>ib.</i>	Importance of Grecian mercenaries to the Egyptian kings—caste of interpreters	495
The Nile in the time of Herodotus	481	Opening of the Kanôpic branch of the Nile to Greek commerce—Greek establishment at Naukratis	496
Thebes and Upper Egypt—of more importance in early times than Lower Egypt, but not so in the days of Herodotus	483	Discontents and mutiny of the Egyptian military order	497
Egyptian castes or hereditary professions	485	Nekôs—son of Psammetichus—his active operations	499
Priests	486	Defeated by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemisch	500
The military order	<i>ib.</i>	Psammis, son of Nekôs Apriês ..	501
Different statements about the castes	488	Amasis — dethrones Apriês by means of the native soldiers ..	502
Large town population of Egypt	489	He encourages Grecian commerce	503
Profound submission of the people	490	Important factory and religious establishment for the Greeks at Naukratis	<i>ib.</i>
Destructive toil imposed by the great monuments	<i>ib.</i>	Prosperity of Egypt under Amasis	505
Worship of animals	492		
Egyptian kings—taken from different parts of the country ..	<i>ib.</i>		
Relations of Egypt with Assyria	493		
Egyptian history not known before Psammetichus	494		

CHAPTER XXI.

DECLINE OF THE PHENICIANS.—GROWTH OF CARTHAGE.

	Page		Page
Decline of the Phenicians—growth of Grecian marine and commerce	506	Carthage	508
Effect of Phenicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians on the Greek mind.—The alphabet.—The scale of money and weight ..	507	Æra of Carthage	509
The gnomon—and the division of the day	508	Dominion of Carthage	<i>ib.</i>
		Dido	510
		First known collision of Greeks and Carthaginians—Massalia ..	511
		Amicable relations between Tyre and Carthage	<i>ib.</i>

CHAPTER XXII.

WESTERN COLONIES OF GREECE—IN EPIRUS, ITALY, SICILY, AND GAUL.

Early unauthenticated emigration from Greece	512	Prosperity of the Sicilian Greeks ..	527
Ante-Hellenic population of Sicily—Sikels—Sikans—Elymi—Phenicians	<i>ib.</i>	Mixed character of the population ..	528
Cenotria—Italia	513	Peculiarity of the monetary and statal system, among the Sicilian and Italian Greeks	529
Pelasgi in Italy	<i>ib.</i>	Sikels and Sikans gradually hellenised	530
Latins—Cenotrians—Epirots—ethnically cognate	514	Difference between the Greeks in Sicily and those in Greece Proper	531
Analogy of languages—Greek, Latin, and Oscan	516	Native population in Sicily not numerous enough to become formidable to the Greek settlers ..	532
Grecian colonisation of ascertained date in Sicily—commences in 735 B.C.	517	Sikel prince Duketius	<i>ib.</i>
Cumæ in Campania—earlier—date unknown	518	Grecian colonies in Southern Italy ..	533
Prosperity of Cumæ between 700–500 B.C.	519	Native population and territory ..	<i>ib.</i>
Decline of Cumæ from 500 B.C. ..	520	Sybaris and Krotôn	535
Revolution—despotism of Aristodêmus	<i>ib.</i>	Territory and colonies of Sybaris and Krotôn	536
Invasion of Cumæ by Tuscans and Samnites from the interior ..	<i>ib.</i>	Epizephyrian Lokri	537
Rapid multiplication of Grecian colonies in Sicily and Italy, beginning with 735 B.C.	521	Original settlers of Lokri—their character and circumstances ..	<i>ib.</i>
Foundation of Naxos in Sicily by Theoklēs	522	Treachery towards the indigenous Sikels	538
Spot where the Greeks first landed in Sicily—memorable afterwards ..	<i>ib.</i>	Mixture of Sikels in their territory—Sikel customs adopted	<i>ib.</i>
Ante-Hellenic distribution of Sicily ..	523	Lokrian lawgiver Zaleukus	539
Foundation of Syracuse	<i>ib.</i>	Rigour of his laws—government of Lokri	<i>ib.</i>
Leontini and Katana	524	Rhêgium	540
Megara in Sicily	525	Chalkidic settlements in Italy and Sicily—Rhêgium, Zanklê, Naxos, Katana, Leontini	541
Gela	<i>ib.</i>	Kaulônia and Skyllêtium	<i>ib.</i>
Zanklê, afterwards Messênê (Messina)	<i>ib.</i>	Siris or Hêrakteia	542
Sub-colonies—Akræ, Kasmenæ, Kamarina, &c.	526	Metapontium	543
Agrirentum, Selinus, Himera, &c. ..	<i>ib.</i>	Tarentum—circumstances of its foundation	<i>ib.</i>
		The Partheniæ—Phalanthus the ækist	544

CHAPTER XXII.—*continued.*

	Page		Page
Situation and territory of Tarentum	545	their organisation, industry, and power	551
Iapygians	546	Grecian world about 560 B.C.—	
Messapians	547	Ionic and Italic Greeks are then	
Prosperity of the Italian Greeks		the most prominent among	
between 700-500 B.C.	548	Greeks	553
Ascendency over the Ænotrian		Consequences of the fall of Sybaris	<i>ib.</i>
population	549	Krotoniates — their salubrity,	
Krotôn and Sybaris —at their maxi-		strength, success in the Olympic	
mum from 560-510 B.C.	<i>ib.</i>	games, &c.	554
The Sybarites — their luxury —		Massalia	555

CHAPTER XXIII.

GRECIAN COLONIES IN AND NEAR EPIRUS.

Korkyra	557	Joint settlements by Corinth and	
Early foundation of Korkyra from		Korkyra	560
Corinth	558	Leukas and Anaktorium	<i>ib.</i>
Relations of Korkyra with Corinth	<i>ib.</i>	Apollonia and Epidamnus	561
Relations with Epirus	559	Relations between these colonies	
Ambrakia founded by Corinth	<i>ib.</i>	—Commerce	563

CHAPTER XXIV.

AKARNANIANS.—EPIROTS.

Akarnanians	565	impossible to mark the bound-	
Their social and political condition	566	aries	568
Epirots — comprising different		Territory distributed into villages	
tribes, with little or no ethnical		—no considerable cities	569
kindred	567	Coast of Epirus discouraging to	
Some of these tribes ethnically		Grecian colonisation	570
connected with those of South-		Some Epirotic tribes governed by	
ern Italy	568	kings, others not	571
Others, with the Macedonians—			

DOMINICA COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

HISTORY OF GREECE.

PART II.

HISTORICAL GREECE.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL GEOGRAPHY AND LIMITS OF GREECE.

GREECE Proper lies between the 36th and 40th parallels of north latitude, and between the 21st and 26th degrees of east longitude. Its greatest length from Mount Olympus to Cape Tænarus may be stated at 250 English miles; its greatest breadth, from the western coast of Akarnania to Marathon in Attica, at 180 miles; and the distance eastward from Ambrakia across Pindus to the Magnesian mountain Homolê and the mouth of the Peneius is about 120 miles. Altogether its area is somewhat less than that of Portugal.¹ In regard however to all attempts at determining the exact limits of Greece proper, we may remark, first, that these limits seem not to have been very precisely defined even among the Greeks themselves; and next, that so large a proportion of the Hellens were distributed among islands and colonies, and so much of their influence upon the world in general produced through their colonies, as to render the extent of their original domicile a matter of comparatively little moment to verify.

The chain called Olympus and the Cambunian mountains, ranging east and west and commencing with the Ægean Sea or the Gulf of Therma near the fortieth degree of north latitude, is prolonged under the name of Mount Lingon until it touches the Adriatic at the Akrokeraunian promontory. The country south of this chain comprehended all that

Limits of
Greece.

Northern
boundary of
Greece—
Olympus.

¹ Compare Strong, *Statistics of the Kingdom of Greece*, p. 2; and Kruse, *Hellas*, vol. i. ch. 3, p. 196.

in ancient times was regarded as Greece or Hellas proper, but it also comprehended something more. Hellas proper¹ (or continuous Hellas, to use the language of Skylax and Dikæarchus) was understood to begin with the town and Gulf of Ambrakia: from thence northward to the Akrokeraunian promontory lay the land called by the Greeks Epirus—occupied by the Chaonians, Molossians, and Thesprotians, who were termed Epirots and were not esteemed to belong to the Hellenic aggregate. This at least was the general understanding, though Ætolians and Akarnanians in their more distant sections seem to have been not less widely removed from the full type of Hellenism than the Epirots were; while Herodotus is inclined to treat even Molossians and Thesprotians as Hellens.²

At a point about midway between the Ægean and Ionian seas, Olympus and Lingon are traversed nearly at right angles by the still longer and vaster chain called Pindus, which stretches in a line rather west of north from the northern side of the range of Olympus. The system to which these mountains belong seems to begin with the lofty masses of greenstone comprised under the name of Mount Scardus or Scordus (Schardagh),³ which is divided only by the narrow cleft containing the river Drin from the limestone of the Albanian Alps. From the southern face of Olympus, Pindus strikes off nearly southward, forming the boundary between Thessaly and Epirus, and sending forth about the 39th degree of latitude the lateral chain of Othrys—which latter takes an easterly course, reaching the sea between Thessaly and the northern coast of Eubœa. Southward of Othrys, the chain of Pindus under the name of Tymphrêstus still continues, until another lateral chain, called Ceta, projects from it again towards the east,

¹ Dikæarch. 31, p. 460, ed. Fuhr:—

‘Η δ’ Ἑλλάς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀμβρακίας εἶναι δοκεῖ
Μάλιστα συνεχὴς τὸ πέρασ· αὐτὴ δ’ ἔρχεται
Ἐπὶ τὸν πόταμον Πηνειὸν, ὡς Φιλῆας γράφει,
Ὅρος τε Μαγνήτων Ὀμόλην κεκλημένον.

Skylax, c. 35.—Ἀμβρακία—ἐντεῦθεν
ἄρχεται ἡ Ἑλλάς συνεχὴς εἶναι μέχρι
Πηνειοῦ πατάμου, καὶ Ὀμολίου Μαγνη-
τικῆς πόλεως, ἥ ἐστι παρὰ τὸν πόταμον.

² Herod. i. 146; ii. 56. The Molossian Alkôn passes for a Hellen (Herod. vi. 127).

³ The mountain systems in the ancient Macedonia and Illyricum, north of Olympus, have been yet but imperfectly examined: see Dr. Griesbach, *Reise durch Rumelien und nach Brussa im Jahre 1839*, vol. ii. ch. 13, p. 112

seqq. (Götting. 1841), which contains much instruction respecting the real relations of these mountains as compared with the different ideas and representations of them. The words of Strabo (lib. vii. Excerpt. 3, ed. Tzschucke), that Scardus, Orbélus, Rhodopê, and Hæmus extend in a straight line from the Adriatic to the Euxine, are incorrect.

See Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, vol. i. p. 335: the pass of Tschangon near Castoria (through which the river Devol passes from the eastward to fall into the Adriatic on the westward) is the only cleft in this long chain from the river Drin in the north down to the centre of Greece.

—forming the lofty coast immediately south of the Maliac Gulf, with the narrow road of Thermopylæ between the two—and terminating at the Eubœan strait. At the point of junction with Cæta, the chain of Pindus forks into two branches; one striking to the westward of south, and reaching across Ætolia, under the names of Arakynthus, Kurius, Korax and Taphiassus, to the promontory called Antirrhion, situated on the northern side of the narrow entrance of the Corinthian Gulf, over against the corresponding promontory of Rhion in Peloponnesus—the other tending south-east, and forming Parnassus, Helicon, and Kithæron; indeed Ægaleus and Hymettus, even down to the southernmost cape of Attica, Sunium, may be treated as a continuance of this chain. From the eastern extremity of Cæta, also, a range of hills, inferior in height to the preceding, takes its departure in a south-easterly direction, under the various names of Knêmis, Ptôon, and Teumêssus. It is joined with Kithærôn by the lateral communication, ranging from west to east, called Parnês; while the celebrated Pentelikus, abundant in marble quarries, constitutes its connecting link, to the south of Parnês, with the chain from Kithærôn to Sunium.

—their extension and dissemination through Southern Greece and Peloponnesus.

From the promontory of Antirrhion the line of mountains crosses into Peloponnesus, and stretches in a southerly direction down to the extremity of the peninsula called Tænarus, now Cape Matapan. Forming the boundary between Elis with Messenia on one side, and Arcadia with Laconia on the other, it bears the successive names of Olenus, Panachaikus, Pholoê, Erymanthus, Lykæus, Parrhasius, and Taygetus. Another series of mountains strikes off from Kithærôn towards the south-west, constituting under the names of Geraneia and Oneia the high ground which first sinks down into the depression forming the Isthmus of Corinth, and then rises again to spread itself in Peloponnesus. One of its branches tends westward along the north of Arkadia, comprising the Akrokorinthus or citadel of Corinth, the high peak of Kyllêne, the mountains of Aroanii and Lampeia, and ultimately joining Erymanthus and Pholoê—while the other branch strikes southward towards the south-eastern cape of Peloponnesus, the formidable Cape Malea or St. Angelo,—and exhibits itself under the successive names of Apesas, Artemisium, Parthenium, Parnôn, Thornax, and Zarêx.

From the eastern extremity of Olympus, in a direction rather to the eastward of south, stretches the range of mountains first called Ossa and afterwards Pelion, down to the south-

Ossa and Pelion—to the Cyclades.

eastern corner of Thessaly. The long, lofty, and naked backbone of the island of Eubœa may be viewed as a continuance both of this chain and of the chain of Othrys: the line is farther prolonged by a series of islands in the Archipelago, Andros, Tênos, Mykonos, and Naxos, belonging to the group called the Cyclades or islands encircling the sacred centre of Delos. Of these Cyclades others are in like manner a continuance of the chain which reaches to Cape Sunium—Keôs, Kythnos, Seriphos, and Siphnos join on to Attica, as Andros does to Eubœa. And we might even consider the great island of Krête as a prolongation of the system of mountains which breasts the winds and waves at Cape Malea, the island of Kythêra forming the intermediate link between them. Skiathus, Skopelus, and Skyrus, to the north-east of Eubœa, also mark themselves out as outlying peaks of the range comprehending Pelion and Eubœa.¹

By this brief sketch, which the reader will naturally compare with one of the recent maps of the country, it will be seen that Greece proper is among the most mountainous territories in Europe. For although it is convenient, in giving a systematic view of the face of the country, to group the multiplicity of mountains into certain chains or ranges, founded upon approximative uniformity of direction; yet in point of fact there are so many ramifications and dispersed peaks—so vast a number of hills and crags of different magnitude and elevation—that a comparatively small proportion of the surface is left for level ground. Not only few continuous plains, but even few continuous valleys, exist throughout all Greece proper. The largest spaces of level ground are seen in Thessaly, in Ætolia, in the western portion of Peloponnesus, and in Bœotia; but irregular mountains, valleys, frequent but isolated, land-locked basins and declivities, which often occur but seldom last long, form the character of the country.²

¹ For the general sketch of the mountain system of Hellas, see Kruse, *Hellas*, vol. i. ch. 4, p. 280–290; Dr. Cramer, *Geography of Ancient Greece*, vol. i. p. 3–8.

Respecting the northern regions, Epirus, Illyria, and Macedonia, O. Müller, in his short but valuable treatise *Ueber die Makedoner*, p. 7 (Berlin, 1825), may be consulted with advantage. This treatise is annexed to the English translation of his *History of the Dorians* by Sir G. C. Lewis.

² Out of the 47,600,000 stremas (= 12,000,000 English acres) included in

the present kingdom of Greece, 26,500,000 go to mountains, rocks, rivers, lakes and forests—and 21,000,000 to arable land, vineyards, olive and currant grounds, &c. By arable land is meant land fit for cultivation; for a comparatively small portion of it is actually cultivated at present. (Strong, *Statistics of Greece*, p. 2, London 1842.)

The modern kingdom of Greece does not include Thessaly. The epithet *κοιλὸς* (hollow) is applied to several of the chief Grecian states—*κοιλὴ Ἥλις*, *κοιλὴ Λακεδαιμῶν*, *κοιλὸν Ἄργος*, &c. Κόρινθος

The islands of the Cyclades, Eubœa, Attica, and Laconia, consist for the most part of micaceous schist, combined with and often covered by crystalline granular limestone.¹ Geological features. The centre and west of Peloponnesus, as well as the country north of the Corinthian Gulf from the Gulf of Ambrakia to the strait of Eubœa, present a calcareous formation, varying in different localities as to colour, consistency, and hardness, but generally belonging or approximating to the chalk: it is often very compact, but is distinguished in a marked manner from the crystalline limestone above-mentioned. The two loftiest summits in Greece² (both however lower than Olympus, estimated at 9700 feet) exhibit this formation—Parnassus which attains 8000 feet, and the point of St. Elias in Taygetus, which is not less than 7800 feet. Clay-slate and conglomerates of sand, lime and clay are found in many parts: a close and firm conglomerate of lime composes the Isthmus of Corinth: loose deposits of pebbles, and calcareous breccia, occupy also some portions of the territory. But the most important and essential elements of the Grecian soil consist of the diluvial and alluvial formations, with which the troughs and basins are filled up, resulting from the decomposition of the older adjoining rocks. In these reside the productive powers of the country, and upon these the grain and vegetables for the subsistence of the people depend. The mountain regions are to a great degree barren, destitute at present of wood or any useful vegetation, though there is reason to believe that they were better wooded in antiquity: in many parts, however, and especially in Ætolia and Akarnania, they afford plenty of timber, and in all parts pasture for the cattle during summer, at a time when the plains are thoroughly burnt up.³ For

Κόρινθος ὀφρῦα τε καὶ κοιλάινεται, Strabo, viii. p. 381.

The fertility of Boeotia is noticed in Strabo, ix. p. 400, and in the valuable fragment of Dikæarchus, *Bios Ἑλλάδος*, p. 140, ed. Fuhr.

¹ For the geological and mineralogical character of Greece, see the survey undertaken by Dr. Fiedler, by orders of the present government of Greece, in 1834 and the following years (*Reise durch alle Theile des Königreichs Griechenland in Auftrag der K. C. Regierung in den Jahren 1834 bis 1837*, especially vol. ii. p. 512–530).

² Griesebach, *Reisen durch Rumelien*, vol. ii. ch. 13, p. 124.

³ In passing through the valley between Ceta and Parnassus, going towards Elateia, Fiedler observes the

striking change in the character of the country: “Romelia (i. e. Akarnania, Ætolia, Ozolian Lokris, &c.), woody, well-watered, and covered with a good soil, ceases at once and precipitously; while craggy limestone mountains of a white grey colour exhibit the cold character of Attica and the Morea.” (*Reise*, i. p. 213.)

The Homeric Hymn to Apollo conceives even the *πέδιον πυρφόρον* of Thebes as having in its primitive state been covered with wood (v. 227).

The best timber used by the ancient Greeks came from Macedonia, the Euxine, and the Propontis: the timber of Mount Parnassus and of Eubœa was reckoned very bad; that of Arcadia better (*Theophrast.* v. 2, 1; iii. 9).

other articles of food, dependence must be had on the valleys, which are occasionally of singular fertility. The low grounds of Thessaly, the valley of the Kephissus and the borders of the lake Kopais in Bœotia, the western portion of Elis, the plains of Stratus on the confines of Akarnania and Ætolia, and those near the river Pamisus in Messenia, both are now and were in ancient times remarkable for their abundant produce.

Besides the scarcity of wood for fuel, there is another serious inconvenience to which the low grounds of Greece are exposed,—the want of a supply of water at once adequate and regular.¹ Abundance of rain falls during the autumnal and winter months, little or none during the summer; while the naked limestone of the numerous hills neither absorbs nor retains moisture, so that the rain runs off as rapidly as it falls. Springs are not numerous.² Most rivers are torrents in early spring, and dry before the end of summer: the copious combinations of the ancient language designated the winter torrent by a special and separate word.³ The most considerable rivers in the country are, the Peneius, which carries off all the waters of Thessaly, finding an exit into the Ægean through the narrow defile which parts Ossa from Olympus,—and the Achelôus, which flows from Pindus in a south-westerly direction, separating Ætolia from Akarnania and emptying itself into the Ionian sea: the Euênus also takes its rise at a more southerly part of the same mountain-chain and falls into the same sea more to the eastward. The rivers more to the southward are unequal and inferior. Kephissus and Asôpus in Bœotia, Pamisus in Messenia, maintain each a languid stream throughout the summer; while the Inachus near Argos, and the Kephissus and Ilissus near Athens, present a scanty reality which falls short still more of their great poetical celebrity. The Alpheius and the Spercheius are considerable streams—the Achelôus is still more important.⁴ The quantity of mud which its turbid stream brought down and deposited, occasioned a sensible increase of the land at its embouchure, within the observation of Thucydides.⁵

¹ See Fiedler, *Reise*, &c. vol. i. pp. 84, 219, 362, &c.

Both Fiedler and Strong (*Statistics of Greece*, p. 169) dwell with great reason upon the inestimable value of Artesian wells for the country.

² Ross, *Reise auf den Griechischen Inseln*, vol. i. letter 2, p. 12.

³ The Greek language seems to stand singular in the expression χειμαρρῶν—

the *Wadys* of Arabia manifest the like alternation, of extreme temporary fullness and violence, with absolute dryness (*Kriegk, Schriften zur allgemeinen Erdkunde*, p. 201, Leipzig 1840).

⁴ Most of the Echinades now rise out of dry land, which has accumulated at the mouth of the Achelôus.

⁵ Thucyd. ii. 102.

But the disposition and properties of the Grecian territory, though not maintaining permanent rivers, are favourable to the multiplication of lakes and marshes. There are numerous hollows and enclosed basins, out of which the water can find no superficial escape, and where, unless it makes for itself a subterranean passage through rifts in the mountains, it remains either as a marsh or a lake according to the time of year. In Thessaly we find the lakes Nessônis and Bœbêis; in Ætolia, between the Achelôus and Euênus, Strabo mentions the lake of Trichônis, besides several other lakes, which it is difficult to identify individually, though the quantity of ground covered by lake and marsh is as a whole very considerable. In Bœotia are situated the lakes Kopaïs, Hylikê, and Harma; the first of the three formed chiefly by the river Kephisus, flowing from Parnassus on the north-west, and shaping for itself a sinuous course through the mountains of Phokis. On the north-east and east, the lake Kopaïs is bounded by the high land of Mount Ptôon, which intercepts its communication with the Strait of Eubœa. Through the limestone of this mountain the water has either found or forced several subterraneous cavities, by which it obtains a partial egress on the other side of the rocky hill and then flows into the strait. The Katabothra, as they were termed in antiquity, yet exist, but in an imperfect and half-obstructed condition. Even in antiquity however they never fully sufficed to carry off the surplus waters of the Kephisus; for the remains are still found of an artificial tunnel, pierced through the whole breadth of the rock, and with perpendicular apertures at proper intervals to let in the air from above. This tunnel—one of the most interesting remnants of antiquity, since it must date from the prosperous days of the old Orchomenus, anterior to its absorption into the Bœotian league, as well as to the preponderance of Thebes—is now choked up and rendered useless. It may perhaps have been designedly obstructed by the hand of an enemy. The scheme of Alexander the Great, who commissioned an engineer from Chalkis to re-open it, was defeated first by discontents in Bœotia, and ultimately by his early death.¹

The Katabothra of the lake Kopaïs are a specimen of the phænomenon so frequent in Greece—lakes and rivers finding for themselves subterranean passages through the cavities in the limestone rocks, and even pursuing their unseen course for a considerable distance before they emerge to the light

Frequent
marshes and
lakes.

Subterranean
course of
rivers, out of
land-locked
basins.

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 407.

of day. In Arcadia, especially, several remarkable examples of subterranean water-communication occur: this central region of Peloponnesus presents a cluster of such completely enclosed valleys or basins.¹

¹ Colonel Leake observes (*Travels in Morea*, vol. iii. pp. 45, 153-155), "the plain of Tripolitza (anciently that of Tegea and Mantinea) is by far the greatest of that cluster of valleys in the centre of Peloponnesus, each of which is so closely shut in by the intersecting mountains, that no outlet is afforded to the waters except through the mountains themselves," &c. Respecting the Arcadian Orchomenus and its enclosed lake with Katabothra, see the same work, p. 103; and the mountain plains near Corinth, p. 263.

This temporary disappearance of the rivers was familiar to the ancient observers—*οἱ καταπνόμενοι τῶν ποτάμων* (Aristot. *Meteorolog.* i. 13. Diodôr. xv. 49. Strabo, vi. p. 271; viii. p. 389, &c.).

Their familiarity with this phenomenon was in part the source of some geographical suppositions, which now appear to us extravagant, respecting the long subterranean and submarine course of certain rivers, and their reappearance at very distant points. Sophokles said that the Inachus of Akarnania joined the Inachus of Argolis; Ibykus the poet affirmed that the Asôpus near Sikyon had its source in Phrygia; the river Inôpus of the little island of Delos was alleged by others to be an effluent from the mighty Nile; and the rhetor Zôilus, in a panegyric oration to the inhabitants of Tenedos, went the length of assuring them that the Alpheius in Elis had its source in their island (Strabo, vi. p. 271). Not only Pindar and other poets (Antigon. Caryl. c. 155), but also the historian Timæus (Timæi Frag. 127, ed. Gôller), and Pausanias also with the greatest confidence (v. 7, 2), believed that the fountain Arethusa at Syracuse was nothing else but the reappearance of the river Alpheius from Peloponnesus: this was attested by the actual fact that a goblet or cup (*φιδλή*) thrown into the Alpheius had come up at the Syracusan fountain, which Timæus professed to have verified,—but even the arguments by which Strabo justifies his disbelief of this tale, show how powerfully the phenomena of the Grecian rivers acted upon his mind. "If (says he, *l. c.*) the Alpheius,

instead of flowing into the sea, fell into some chasm in the earth, there would be some plausibility in supposing that it continued its subterranean course as far as Sicily without mixing with the sea: but since its junction with the sea is matter of observation, and since there is no aperture visible near the shore to absorb the water of the river (*στόμα τὸ καταπνὸν τὸ ῥέυμα τοῦ ποτάμου*), so it is plain that the water cannot maintain its separation and its sweetness, whereas the spring Arethusa is perfectly good to drink." I have translated here the sense rather than the words of Strabo; but the phenomena of "rivers falling into chasms and being drunk up" for a time is exactly what happens in Greece. It did not appear to Strabo impossible that the Alpheius might traverse so great a distance underground; nor do we wonder at this when we learn that a more able geographer than he (Eratosthenês) supposed that the marshes of Rhinokolura, between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, were formed by the Euphratês and Tigris, which flowed underground for the length of 6000 stadia or furlongs (Strabo, xvi. p. 741; Seidel, *Fragm. Eratosth.* p. 194): compare the story about the Euphrates passing underground and reappearing in Ethiopia as the river Nile (Pausan. ii. 5, 3). This disappearance and reappearance of rivers connected itself, in the minds of ancient physical philosophers, with the supposition of vast reservoirs of water in the interior of the earth, which were protruded upwards to the surface by some gaseous force (see Seneca, *Nat. Quæst.* vi. 8). Pomponius Mela mentions an idea of some writers, that the source of the Nile was to be found, not in our (*οἰκουμένη*) habitable section of the globe, but in the Antichthon, or southern continent, and that it flowed under the ocean to rise up in Ethiopia (Mela, i. 9, 55).

These views of the ancients, evidently based upon the analogy of Grecian rivers, are well set forth by M. Letronne in a paper on the situation of the Terrestrial Paradise as represented by the Fathers of the Church; cited in A. von

It will be seen from these circumstances, that Greece, considering its limited total extent, offers but little motive and still less of convenient means, for internal communication among its various inhabitants.¹ Each village or township, occupying its plain with the enclosing mountains,² supplied its own main wants, whilst the transport of commodities by land was sufficiently difficult to discourage greatly any regular commerce with neighbours. In so far as the face of the interior country was concerned, it seemed as if nature had been disposed from the beginning to keep the population of Greece socially and politically disunited—by providing so many hedges of separation, and so many boundaries, generally hard, sometimes impossible, to overleap. One special motive to intercourse, however, arose out of this very geographical constitution of the country, and its endless alternation of mountain and valley. The difference of climate and temperature between the high and low grounds is very great; the harvest is secured in one place before it is ripe in another, and the cattle find during the heat of summer shelter and pasture on the hills, at a time when the plains are burnt up.³ The practice of transferring them from the mountains to the plain according to the change of season, which subsists still as it did in ancient times, is intimately connected with the structure of the country, and must

Difficulty of land-communication and transport in Greece.

Humboldt, *Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie*, &c., vol. iii. p. 118-130.

¹ "Upon the arrival of the king and regency in 1833 (observes Mr. Strong), no carriage roads existed in Greece; nor were they indeed much wanted previously, as down to that period not a carriage, waggon, or cart, or any other description of vehicles, was to be found in the whole country. The traffic in general was carried on by means of boats, to which the long indented line of the Grecian coast and its numerous islands afforded every facility. Between the seaports and the interior of the kingdom, the communication was effected by means of beasts of burden, such as mules, horses, and camels." (*Statistics of Greece*, p. 33.)

This exhibits a retrograde march to a point lower than the description of the *Odyssey*, where Telemachus and Peisistratus drive their chariot from Pylus to Sparta. The remains of the ancient roads are still seen in many parts of Greece (Strong, p. 34).

² Dr. Clarke's description deserves to

be noticed, though his warm eulogies on the fertility of the soil, taken generally, are not borne out by later observers:—"The physical phenomena of Greece, differing from those of any other country, present a series of beautiful plains, successively surrounded by mountains of limestone; resembling, although upon a larger scale, and rarely accompanied by volcanic products, the craters of the Phlegrean fields. Everywhere their level surfaces seem to have been deposited by water, gradually retired or evaporated; they consist for the most part of the richest soil, and their produce is yet proverbially abundant. In this manner stood the cities of Argos, Sikyon, Corinth, Megara, Eleusis, Athens, Thebes, Amphissa, Orchomenus, Chæronea, Lebadea, Larissa, Pella, and many others." (*Dr. Clarke's Travels*, vol. ii. ch. 4, p. 74.)

³ Sir W. Gell found, in the month of March, summer in the low plains of Messenia, spring in Laconia, winter in Arcadia (*Journey in Greece*, p. 355-359).

from the earliest period have brought about communication among the otherwise disunited villages.¹

Such difficulties, however, in the internal transit by land were to a great extent counteracted by the large proportion of coast and the accessibility of the country by sea. The prominences and indentations in the line of Grecian coast are hardly less remarkable

Indentations
in the line
of coast—
universal
accessibility
by sea.

than the multiplicity of elevations and depressions which everywhere mark the surface.² The shape of Peloponnesus, with its three southern gulfs (the Argolic, Læonian and Messenian), was compared by the ancient

geographers to the leaf of a plane-tree: the Pagasæan Gulf on the eastern side of Greece, and the Ambrakian Gulf on the western, with their narrow entrances and considerable area, are equivalent to internal lakes: Xenophon boasts of the double sea which embraces so large a proportion of Attica, Ephorus of the triple sea by which Bœotia was accessible from west, north, and south—the Eubœan Strait opening a long line of country on both sides to coasting navigation.³ But the most important of all Grecian gulfs are the Corinthian and the Saronic, washing the northern and north-eastern shores of Peloponnesus and separated by the narrow barrier of the Isthmus of Corinth. The former, especially, lays open Ætolia, Phokis, and Bœotia, as well as the

¹ The cold central region (or mountain plain — *δρυπῆδιον*) of Tripolitza differs in climate from the maritime regions of Peloponnesus, as much as the south of England from the south of France No appearance of spring on the trees near Tegea, though not more than twenty-four miles from Argos Cattle are sent from thence every winter to the maritime plains of Elos in Laconia (Leake, Trav. in Morea, vol. i. pp. 88, 98, 197). The pasture on Mount Oloro (boundary of Elis, Arcadia, and Achaia) is not healthy until June (Leake, vol. ii. p. 119); compare p. 348, and Fiedler, Reise, i. p. 314.

See also the instructive Inscription of Orchomenus, in Boeckh, Staatshaushaltung der Athener, t. ii. p. 380.

The transference of cattle, belonging to proprietors in one state, for temporary pasturage in another, is as old as the Odyssey, and is marked by various illustrative incidents: see the cause of the first Messenian war (Diodor. Fragm. viii. vol. iv. p. 23, ed. Wess.; Pausan. iv. 4, 2).

² “Universa autem (Peloponnesus),

velut pensante æquorum incursus naturâ, in montes 76 extollitur.” (Plin. H. N. iv. 6.)

Strabo touches, in a striking passage (ii. p. 121–122), on the influence of the sea in determining the shape and boundaries of the land: his observations upon the great superiority of Europe over Asia and Africa in respect of intersection and interpenetration of land by the sea-water are remarkable: *ἡ μὲν οὖν Εὐρώπη πολυσχημονεστάτη πασῶν ἐστὶ, &c.* He does not especially name the coast of Greece, though his remarks have a more exact bearing upon Greece than upon any other country. And we may copy a passage out of Tacitus (Agricol. c. 10), written in reference to Britain, which applies far more precisely to Greece: “nusquam latius dominari mare nec litore tenuis accrescere aut resorberi, sed influere penitus et ambire, et jugis etiam atque montibus inseri velut in suo.”

³ Xenophon, De Vectigal. c. 1; Ephor. Frag. 67, ed. Marx; Stephan. Byz. Βοιωτία.

whole northern coast of Peloponnesus, to water approach. Corinth in ancient times served as an entrepôt for the trade between Italy and Asia Minor—goods being unshipped at Lechæum, the port on the Corinthian Gulf, and carried by land across to Kenchreæ, the port on the Saronic: indeed even the merchant-vessels themselves, when not very large,¹ were conveyed across by the same route. It was accounted a prodigious advantage to escape the necessity of sailing round Cape Malea: and the violent winds and currents which modern experience attests to prevail around that formidable promontory, are quite sufficient to justify the apprehensions of the ancient Greek merchant, with his imperfect apparatus for navigation.²

It will thus appear that there was no part of Greece Proper which could be considered as out of reach of the sea, while most parts of it were convenient and easy of access: in fact, the Arcadians were the only large section of the Hellenic name (we may add the Doric Tetrapolis and the mountaineers along the chain of Pindus and Tymphrêstus) who were altogether without a seaport.³ But Greece Proper constituted only a fraction of the entire Hellenic world, during the historical age: there were the numerous islands, and still more numerous continental colonies, all located as independent intruders on distinct points of the coast,⁴ in the Euxine, the Ægean, the Medi-

Sea-commu-
nication
essential for
the islands
and colonies.

¹ Pliny, H. N. iv. 5, about the Isthmus of Corinth: "Lechææ hinc, Cenchreæ illinc, angustiarum termini, longo et ancipiti navium ambitu (i. e. round Cape Malea), quas magnitudo plaustri transvehi prohibet: quam ob causam perfodere navigabili alveo angustias eas tentavere Demetrius rex, dictator Cæsar, Caius princeps, Domitius Nero—infausto (ut omnium exitu patuit) incepto."

The διολκός, less than four miles across, where ships were drawn across, if their size permitted, stretched from Lechæum on the Corinthian Gulf, to Schœnus, a little eastward of Kenchreæ, on the Saronic Gulf (Strabo, viii. p. 380). Strabo (viii. p. 335) reckons the breadth of the διολκός at forty stadia (about 4½ English miles); the reality, according to Leake, is 3½ English miles (Travels in Morea, vol. iii. ch. xxix. p. 297).

² The north wind, the Etesian wind of the ancients, blows strong in the Ægean nearly the whole summer, and with especially dangerous violence at

three points,—under Karystos, the southern cape of Eubœa, near Cape Malea, and in the narrow strait between the islands of Tênos, Mykonos, and Dêlos (Ross, Reisen auf den Griechischen Inseln, vol. i. p. 20). See also Colonel Leake's account of the terror of the Greek boatmen from the gales and currents round Mount Athos: the canal cut by Xerxes through the isthmus was justified by sound reasons (Travels in Northern Greece, vol. iii. c. 24, p. 145).

³ The Periplus of Skylax enumerates every section of the Greek name, with the insignificant exceptions noticed in the text, as partaking of the line of coast; it even mentions Arcadia (c. 45), because at that time Lepreum had shaken off the supremacy of Elis, and was confederated with the Arcadians (about 360 B.C.): Lepreum possessed about twelve miles of coast, which therefore count as Arcadian.

⁴ Cicero (De Republicâ, ii. 2-4, in the fragments of that lost treatise, ed. Maii) notices emphatically both the

terranean and the Adriatic; and distant from each other by the space which separates Trebizond from Marseilles. All these various cities were comprised in the name *Hellas*, which implied no geographical continuity: all prided themselves on Hellenic blood, name, religion and mythical ancestry. As the only communication between them was maritime, so the sea, important even if we look to Greece Proper exclusively, was the sole channel for transmitting ideas and improvements, as well as for maintaining sympathies, social, political, religious, and literary, throughout these outlying members of the Hellenic aggregate.

The ancient philosophers and legislators were deeply impressed with the contrast between an inland and a maritime city: in the former, simplicity and uniformity of life, tenacity of ancient habits and dislike of what is new or foreign, great force of exclusive sympathy and narrow range both of objects and ideas; in the latter, variety and novelty of sensations, expansive imagination, toleration, and occasional preference for extraneous customs, greater activity of the individual and corresponding mutability of the state. This distinction stands prominent in the many comparisons instituted between the Athens of Periklês and the Athens of the earlier times down to Solôn. Both Plato and Aristotle dwell upon it emphatically—and the former especially, whose genius conceived the comprehensive scheme of prescribing beforehand and ensuring in practice the whole course of individual thought and feeling in his imaginary community, treats maritime communication, if pushed beyond the narrowest limits, as fatal to the success and permanence of any wise scheme of education. Certain it is that a great difference of character existed between those Greeks who mingled much in maritime affairs, and those who did not. The Arcadian may stand as a type of the pure Grecian

Views of the ancient philosophers on the influence of maritime habits and commerce.

Difference between the land-states and the sea-states in Greece.

general maritime accessibility of Grecian towns, and the effects of that circumstance on Grecian character:—"Quod de Corintho dixi, id haud scio an liceat de cunctâ Græciâ verissime dicere. Nam et ipsa Peloponnesus fere tota in mari est: nec præter Phliuntios ulli sunt, quorum agri non contingant mare: et extra Peloponnesum Ænïanes et Dores et Dolopes soli absunt a mari. Quid dicam insulas Græciæ, quæ fluctibus cinctæ natant pæne ipsæ simul cum civitatum institutis et moribus? Atque hæc quidem, ut supra dixi, veteris sunt Græciæ. Coloniarum vero quæ est deducta a Graiis in Asiam,

Thraciam, Italiam, Siciliam, Africam, præter unam Magnesiam, quam unda non alluat? Ita barbarorum agris quasi adtexta quædam videtur ora esse Græciæ."

Compare Cicero, *Epistol. ad Attic.* vi. 2, with the reference to Dikæarchus, who agreed to a great extent in Plato's objections against a maritime site (*De Legg.* iv. p. 705; also *Aristot. Politic.* vii. 5-6). The sea (says Plato) is indeed a salt and bitter neighbour (μάλα γε μὴν ὄντως ἄλμυρόν καὶ πικρὸν γειτόνημα), though convenient for purposes of daily use.

landsman, with his rustic and illiterate habits¹—his diet of sweet chestnuts, barley cakes and pork (as contrasted with the fish which formed the chief seasoning for the bread of an Athenian)—his superior courage and endurance—his reverence for Lacedæmonian headship as an old and customary influence—his sterility of intellect and imagination as well as his slackness in enterprise—his unchangeable rudeness of relations with the gods, which led him to scourge and prick Pan if he came back empty-handed from the chase; while the inhabitant of Phôkæa or Milêtus exemplifies the Grecian mariner, eager in search of gain—active, skilful, and daring at sea, but inferior in steadfast bravery on land—more excitable in imagination as well as more mutable in character—full of pomp and expense in religious manifestations towards the Ephesian Artemis or the Apollo of Branchidæ: with a mind more open to the varieties of Grecian energy and to the refining influences of Grecian civilization. The Peloponnesians generally, and the Lacedæmonians in particular, approached to the Arcadian type—while the Athenians of the fifth century B.C. stood foremost in the other; superadding to it however a delicacy of taste, and a predominance of intellectual sympathy and enjoyments, which seem to have been peculiar to themselves.

The configuration of the Grecian territory, so like in many respects to that of Switzerland, produced two effects of great moment upon the character and history of the people. In the first place, it materially strengthened their powers of defence: it shut up the country against those invasions from the interior which successively subjugated all their continental colonies; and it at the same time rendered each fraction more difficult to be attacked by the rest, so as to exercise a certain conservative influence in assuring the tenure of actual possessors: for the pass of Thermopylæ between Thessaly and Phokis, that of Kithærôn between Bœotia and Attica, or the mountainous range of Oneion and Gerancia along the Isthmus of Corinth, were positions which an inferior number of brave men could hold against a much greater force of assailants.

Effects of the configuration of Greece upon the political relations of the inhabitants.

¹ Hekataeus, *Fragm.* Ἀραδικὸν δεῖπνον . . . μᾶζας καὶ θεία κρέα. Herodot. i. 66. Βαλανήφαγοι ἄνδρες. Theocrit. Id. vii. 106.—

Κῆν μὲν ταῦθ' ἐρῶς, ὦ Πᾶν φίλε, μή τί τι παῖδες

Ἀραδικοὶ σκύλλαισιν ὑπὸ πλευράς τε καὶ ὤμους Τανίκα μαστίσδοιεν ὅτε κρέα τυτθὰ παρείη

Εἰ δ' ἄλλως νεύσαις κατὰ μὲν χρόα πάντ' ὀνύχουσι
Δακνόμενος κνάσαιο, &c.

The alteration of Χῖοι, which is obviously out of place, in the scholia on this passage, to ἔνιοι, appears unquestionable.

But, in the next place, while it tended to protect each section of Greeks from being conquered, it also kept them politically dis-united and perpetuated their separate autonomy. It fostered that powerful principle of repulsion, which disposed even the smallest township to constitute itself a political unit apart from the rest, and to resist all idea of coalescence with others, either amicable or compulsory. To a modern reader, accustomed to large political aggregations, and securities for good government through the representative system, it requires a certain mental effort to transport himself back to a time when even the smallest town clung so tenaciously to its right of self-legislation. Nevertheless such was the general habit and feeling of the ancient world, throughout Italy, Sicily, Spain, and Gaul. Among the Hellenes it stands out more conspicuously, for several reasons—first, because they seem to have pushed the multiplication of autonomous units to an extreme point, seeing that even islands not larger than *Peparêthos* and *Amorgos* had two or three separate city communities;¹ secondly, because they produced, for the first time in the history of mankind, acute systematic thinkers on matters of government, amongst all of whom the idea of the autonomous city was accepted as the indispensable basis of political speculation; thirdly, because this incurable subdivision proved finally the cause of their ruin, in spite of pronounced intellectual superiority over their conquerors; and lastly, because incapacity of political coalescence did not preclude a powerful and extensive sympathy between the inhabitants of all the separate cities, with a constant tendency to fraternise for numerous purposes, social, religious, recreative, intellectual, and æsthetical. For these reasons, the indefinite multiplication of self-governing towns, though in truth a phænomenon common to ancient Europe as contrasted with the large monarchies of Asia, appears more marked among the ancient Greeks than elsewhere: and there cannot be any doubt that they owe it, in a considerable degree, to the multitude of insulating boundaries which the configuration of their country presented.

Nor is it rash to suppose that the same causes may have tended to promote that unborrowed intellectual development for which they stand so conspicuous. General propositions respecting the working of climate and physical agencies upon character are indeed treacherous; for our knowledge of the globe is now sufficient to teach us that heat and cold, moun-

Effects upon
their intel-
lectual de-
velopment.

¹ Skylax, *Peripl.* 59.

tain and plain, sea and land, moist and dry atmosphere, are all consistent with the greatest diversities of resident men : moreover the contrast between the population of Greece itself, for the seven centuries preceding the Christian æra, and the Greeks of more modern times, is alone enough to inculcate reserve in such speculations. Nevertheless we may venture to note certain improving influences, connected with their geographical position, at a time when they had no books to study, and no more advanced predecessors to imitate. We may remark, first, that their position made them at once mountaineers and mariners, thus supplying them with great variety of objects, sensations, and adventures ; next, that each petty community, nestled apart amidst its own rocks,¹ was sufficiently severed from the rest to possess an individual life and attributes of its own, yet not so far as to subtract it from the sympathies of the remainder ; so that an observant Greek, commercing with a great diversity of half-countrymen, whose language he understood, and whose idiosyncrasies he could appreciate, had access to a larger mass of social and political experience than any other man in so unadvanced an age could personally obtain. The Phœnician, superior to the Greek on ship-board, traversed wider distances and saw a greater number of strangers, but had not the same means of intimate communion with a multiplicity of fellows in blood and language. His relations, confined to purchase and sale, did not comprise that mutuality of action and reaction which pervaded the crowd at a Grecian festival. The scene which here presented itself was a mixture of uniformity and variety highly stimulating to the observant faculties of a man of genius,—who at the same time, if he sought to communicate his own impressions, or to act upon this mingled and diverse audience, was forced to shake off what was peculiar to his own town or community, and to put forth matter in harmony with the feelings of all. It is thus that we may explain in part that penetrating apprehension of human life and character, and that power of touching sympathies common to all ages and nations, which surprises us so much in the unlettered authors of the old epic. Such periodical intercommunion, of brethren habitually isolated from each other, was the only means then open of procuring for the bard a diversified range of experience and a many-coloured audience ; and it was to a great degree the result of geographical

¹ Cicero, de Orator. i. 44, "Ithacam illam in asperrimis saxulis, sicut nidulum, affixam."

causes. Perhaps among other nations such facilitating causes might have been found, yet without producing any result comparable to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But Homer was nevertheless dependent upon the conditions of his age, and we can at least point out those peculiarities in early Grecian society without which Homeric excellence would never have existed,—the geographical position is one, the language another.

In mineral and metallic wealth Greece was not distinguished. Gold was obtained in considerable abundance in the island of Siphnos, which, throughout the sixth century B.C., was among the richest communities of Greece, and possessed a treasure-chamber at Delphi distinguished for the richness of its votive offerings. At that time gold was so rare in Greece, that the Lacedæmonians were obliged to send to the Lydian Cræsus in order to provide enough of it for the gilding of a statue.¹ It appears to have been more abundant in Asia Minor, and the quantity of it in Greece was much multiplied by the opening of mines in Thrace, Macedonia, Epirus, and even some parts of Thessaly. In the island of Thasos, too, some mines were reopened with profitable result, which had been originally begun, and subsequently abandoned, by Phœnician settlers of an earlier century. From these same districts also was procured a considerable amount of silver; while about the beginning of the fifth century B.C., the first effective commencement seems to have been made of turning to account the rich southern district of Attica, called Laureion. Copper was obtained in various parts of Greece, especially in Cyprus and Eubœa—in which latter island was also found the earth called Cadmia, employed for the purification of the ore. Bronze was used among the Greeks for many purposes in which iron is now employed: and even the arms of the Homeric heroes (different in this respect from the later historical Greeks) are composed of copper, tempered in such a way as to impart to it an astonishing hardness. Iron was found in Eubœa, Bœœtia, and Melos—but still more abundantly in the mountainous region of the Laconian Taygetus. There is however no part of Greece where the remains of ancient metallurgy appear now so conspicuous, as the island of Seriphos. The excellence and varieties of

¹ Herodot. i. 52; iii. 57; vi. 46–125. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens*, B. i. ch. 3.

The gold and silver offerings sent to the Delphian temple, even from the Ho-

meric times (Il. ix. 405) downwards, were numerous and valuable; especially those dedicated by Cræsus, who (Herodot. i. 17–52) seems to have surpassed all predecessors.

marble, from Pentelikus, Hymettus, Paros, Karystus, &c., and other parts of the country—so essential for purposes of sculpture and architecture—is well known.¹

Situated under the same parallels of latitude as the coast of Asia Minor, and the southernmost regions of Italy and Spain, Greece produced wheat, barley, flax, wine, and ^{its chief} oil, in the earliest times of which we have any knowledge; though the currants, Indian corn, silk, and tobacco which the country now exhibits, are an addition of more recent times. Theophrastus and other authors amply attest the observant and industrious agriculture prevalent among the ancient Greeks, as well as the care with which its various natural productions, comprehending a great diversity of plants, herbs, and trees, were turned to account. The cultivation of the vine and the olive—the latter indispensable to ancient life not merely for the purposes which it serves at present, but also from the constant habit then prevalent of anointing the body—appears to have been particularly elaborate; and the many different accidents of soil, level, and exposure, which were to be found, not only in Hellas Proper, but also among the scattered Greek settlements, afforded to observant planters materials for study and comparison. The barley-cake seems to have been more generally eaten than the wheaten loaf;² but one or other of them, together with vegetables and fish (sometimes fresh, but more frequently salt), was the common food of the population; the Arcadians fed much upon pork, and the Spartans also consumed animal food, but by the Greeks generally fresh meat seems to have been little eaten, except at festivals and sacrifices. The Athenians, the most commercial people in Greece Proper, though their light, dry, and comparatively poor soil produced excellent barley, nevertheless did not grow enough corn for their own consumption: they imported considerable supplies of corn from Sicily, from the coasts of the Euxine, and the Tauric Chersonese, and salt fish both from the Propontis and even from Gades:³ the distance from whence

¹ Strabo, x. p. 447; xiv. p. 680–684. Stephan. Byz. v. *Αἰθῆψος*, *Λακεδαιμῶν*. Kruse, Hellas, ch. iv. vol. i. p. 328. Fiedler, Reisen in Griechenland, vol. ii. p. 118–559.

² At the repast provided at the public cost for those who dined in the Prytæneum of Athens, Solôn directed barley-cakes for ordinary days, wheaten bread for festivals (Athenæus, iv. p. 137).

The milk of ewes and goats was in

ancient Greece preferred to that of cows (Aristot. Hist. Animal. iii. 15, 5–7); at present also cow's-milk and butter is considered unwholesome in Greece, and is seldom or never eaten (Kruse, Hellas, vol. i. ch. 4. p. 368).

³ Theophrast. Caus. Pl. ix. 2; Demosthen. adv. Leptin. c. 9. That salt-fish from the Propontis and from Gades was sold in the markets of Athens during the Peloponnesian war, appears from a

these supplies came, when we take into consideration the extent of fine corn-land in Bœotia and Thessaly, proves how little internal trade existed between the various regions of Greece Proper. The exports of Athens consisted in her figs and other fruit, olives, oil—for all of which she was distinguished—together with pottery, ornamental manufactures, and the silver from her mines at Laureion. Salt-fish doubtless found its way more or less throughout all Greece;¹ but the population of other states in Greece lived more exclusively upon their own produce than the Athenians, with less of purchase and sale²—a mode of life assisted by the simple domestic economy universally prevalent, in which the women not only carded and spun all the wool, but also wove out of it the clothing and bedding employed in the family. Weaving was then considered as much a woman's business as spinning, and the same feeling and habits still prevail to the present day in modern Greece, where the loom is constantly seen in the peasant's cottages, and always worked by women.³

The climate of Greece appears to be generally described by modern travellers in more favourable terms than it was by the ancients, which is easily explicable from the classical interest, picturesque beauties, and transparent atmosphere, so vividly appreciated by an English or a German eye. Herodotus,⁴ Hippokrates, and Aristotle, treat the climate of Asia as far more genial and favourable both to animal and vegetable life, but at the same time more enervating than that of Greece: the latter they speak of chiefly in reference to its changeful character and diversities of local temperature, which they consider as highly stimulant to the energies of the inha-

Climate—
better and
more healthy
in ancient
times than
it is now.

fragment of the Marikas of Eupolis (Fr. 23, ed. Meineke; Stephan. Byz. v. Γάδεια):—

Πότερ' ἦν τὸ τάριχος, Φρύγιον ἢ Γαδειρικόν;

The Phœnician merchants who brought the salt-fish from Gades, took back with them Attic pottery for sale among the African tribes of the coast of Morocco (Skylax, Peripl. c. 109).

¹ Simonidēs, Fragm. 109, Gaisford.—

Πρόσθε μὲν ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχων τρηχέαν ἀσιν-
λαν

Ἰχθὺς ἐξ Ἀργους εἰς Τεγέαν ἔφερον, &c.

The Odyssey mentions certain inland people who knew nothing either of the sea, or of ships, or the taste of salt: Pausanias looks for them in Epirus (Odyss. xi. 121; Pausan. i. 12, 3).

² Αὐτουργοὶ τε γάρ εἰσι Πελοποννήσιοι (says Perikles in his speech to the Athenians at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, Thucyd. i. 141) καὶ οὔτε ἰδίᾳ οὔτε ἐν κοινῷ χρήματά ἐστιν αὐτοῖς, &c.—ἄνδρες γεωργοὶ καὶ οὐ θαλάσσιοι, &c. (ib. c. 142).

³ In Egypt the men sat at home and wove, while the women did out-door business; both the one and the other excite the surprise of Herodotus and Sophoklēs (Herod. ii. 35; Soph. Œd. Col. 340).

For the spinning and weaving of the modern Greek peasant women, see Leake, Trav. Morea, vol. i. pp. 13, 18, 223, &c.; Strong, Stat. p. 185.

⁴ Herodot. i. 142; Hippokrat. De Aëre, Loc. et Aq. c. 12-13; Aristot. Polit. vii. 6, 1.

bitants. There is reason to conclude that ancient Greece was much more healthy than the same territory is at present, inasmuch as it was more industriously cultivated, and the towns both more carefully administered and better supplied with water. But the differences in respect of healthiness, between one portion of Greece and another, appear always to have been considerable, and this, as well as the diversities of climate, affected the local habits and character of the particular sections. Not merely were there great differences between the mountaineers and the inhabitants of the plains¹—between Lokrians, Ætoli-
Great difference between one part of Greece and another.
 ans, Phokians, Dorians, Cætæans and Arcadians, on one hand, and the inhabitants of Attica, Bœotia, and Elis, on the other—but each of the various tribes which went to compose these categories had its peculiarities; and the marked contrast between Athenians and Bœotians was supposed to be represented by the light and heavy atmosphere which they respectively breathed. Nor was this all: for even among the Bœotian aggregate, every town had its own separate attributes, physical as well as moral and political:² Orôpus, Tanagra, Thespiæ, Thebes, Anthêdôn, Haliartus, Korôneia, Onchêstus, and Plataea, were known to Bœotians each by its own characteristic epithet: and Dikæarchus even notices a marked distinction between the inhabitants of the city of Athens and those in the country of Attica. Sparta, Argos, Corinth, and Sikyôn, though all called Doric, had each its own dialect and peculiarities. All these differences, depending in part upon climate, site, and other physical considerations, contributed to nourish antipathies, and to perpetuate that imperfect cohesion, which has already been noticed as an indelible feature in Hellas.

The Epirotic tribes, neighbours of the Ætoli-
 ans, filled the space between Pindus and the Ionian Sea until they joined to the northward the territory inhabited by the powerful and barbarous Illyrians. Of these Illyrians the native Macedonian tribes appear to have been an outlying section, dwelling northward of Thessaly and Mount Olympus, east-

Epirots,
Macedonians,
&c.

¹ The mountaineers of Ætolia are, at this time, unable to come down into the marshy plain of Wrachôri, without being taken ill after a few days (Fiedler, *Reise in Griech.* i. p. 184).

² Dikæarch. *Fragm.* p. 145, ed. Fuhr—*Bíos 'Ελλάδος. 'Ιστοροῦσι δ' οἱ Βοιωτοὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ὑπάρχοντα ἴδια ἀκκληρήματα λέγοντες ταῦτα*—Τὴν μὲν αἰσχροκέρδειαν κατοικεῖν ἐν Ὠρώπῳ, τὸν δὲ φθό-

νον ἐν Τανάγρα, τὴν φιλονεικίαν ἐν Θεσπιάς, τὴν ὕβριν ἐν Θήβαις, τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἐν Ἀνθήδονι, τὴν περιεργίαν ἐν Κορωνείᾳ, ἐν Πλαταίαις τὴν ἀλαζόνειαν, τὸν πυρετὸν ἐν Ὀγχήστῃ, τὴν ἀναισθησίαν ἐν Ἀλιάρτῳ.

About the distinction between Ἀθηναῖοι and Ἀττικοί, see the same work, p. 11.

ward of the chain by which Pindus is continued, and westward of the river Axius. The Epirots were comprehended under the various denominations of Chaonians, Molossians, Thesprotians, Kassopæans, Amphilocheians, Athamānes, the Æthikes, Tymphæi, Orestæ, Paroræi, and Atintānes¹—most of the latter being small communities dispersed about the mountainous region of Pindus. There was however much confusion in the application of the comprehensive name *Epirot*, which was a title given altogether by the Greeks, and given purely upon geographical, not upon ethnical considerations. Epirus seems at first to have stood opposed to Peloponnesus, and to have signified the general region northward of the Gulf of Corinth; and in this primitive sense it comprehended the Ætolians and Akarnanians, portions of whom spoke a dialect difficult to understand, and were not less widely removed than the Epirots from Hellenic habits.² The oracle of Dodona forms the point of ancient union between Greeks and Epirots, which was superseded by Delphi as the civilization of Hellas developed itself. Nor is it less difficult to distinguish Epirots from Macedonians on the one hand than from Hellenes on the other; the language, the dress, and the fashion of wearing the hair being often analogous, while the boundaries, amidst rude men and untravelled tracts, were very inaccurately understood.³

In describing the limits occupied by the Hellens in 776 B.C., we cannot yet take account of the important colonies of Leukas and Ambrakia, established by the Corinthians subsequently on the western coast of Epirus. The Greeks of that early time seem to comprise the islands of Kephallenia, Zakynthus, Ithaka, and Dulichium, but no settlement, either inland or insular, farther northward.

They include farther, confining ourselves to 776 B.C., the great mass of islands between the coast of Greece and that of Asia Minor, from Tenedos on the north, to Rhodes, Krete, and Kythêra southward; and the great islands of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, and Eubœa, as well as the groups called the Sporades and the Cyclades. Respecting the four considerable islands nearer to the coasts of Macedonia and Thrace—Lemnos, Imbros, Samothrace, and Thasos

¹ Strabo, vii. pp. 323, 324, 326; Thucyd. ii. 68. Theopompus (ap. Strab. l. c.) reckoned 14 Epirotic *ἔθνη*.

² Herodot. i. 146, ii. 56, vi. 127.

³ Strabo, vii. p. 327.

Several of the Epirotic tribes were *διγλωσσοι*,—spoke Greek in addition to

their native tongue.

See, on all the inhabitants of these regions, the excellent dissertation of O. Müller above quoted, Ueber die Make-doner; appended to the first volume of the English translation of his History of the Dorians.

—it may be doubted whether they were at that time hellenised. The Catalogue of the *Iliad* includes under Agamemnôn contingents from Ægina, Eubœa, Krete, Karpatus, ^{Islands in the Ægean.} Kasus, Kôs, and Rhodes; in the oldest epical testimony which we possess, these islands thus appear inhabited by Greeks; but the others do not occur in the Catalogue, and are never mentioned in such manner as to enable us to draw any inference. Eubœa ought perhaps rather to be looked upon as a portion of Grecian mainland (from which it was only separated by a strait narrow enough to be bridged over) than as an island. But the last five islands named in the Catalogue are all either wholly or partially Doric: no Ionic or Æolic island appears in it: these latter, though it was among them that the poet sung, appear to be represented by their ancestral heroes who come from Greece Proper.

The last element to be included, as going to make up the Greece of 776 B.C., is the long string of Doric, Ionic and Æolic ^{Greeks on the coast of Asia Minor.} settlements on the coast of Asia Minor—occupying a space bounded on the north by the Troad and the region of Ida, and extending southward as far as the peninsula of Knidus. Twelve continental cities, over and above the islands of Lesbos and Tenedos, are reckoned by Herodotus as ancient Æolic foundations—Smyrna, Kymê, Larissa, Neon-Teichos, Têmnos, Killa, Notium, Ægiroessa, Pitana, Ægæ, Myrina, and Gryneia. Smyrna, having been at first Æolic, was afterwards acquired through a stratagem by Ionic inhabitants, and remained permanently Ionic. Phokæa, the northernmost of the Ionic settlements, bordered upon Æolis: Klazomenæ, Erythræ, Teôs, Lebedos, Kolophôn, Priêne, Myus, and Milêtus, continued the Ionic name to the southward. These, together with Samos and Chios, formed the Panionic federation.¹ To the south of Milêtus, after a considerable interval, lay the Doric establishments of Myndus, Halikarnassus, and Knidus: the two latter, together with the island of Kôs and the three townships in Rhodes, constituted the Doric Hexapolis, or communion of six cities, concerted primarily with a view to religious purposes, but producing a secondary effect analogous to political federation.

Such then is the extent of Hellas, as it stood at the commencement of the recorded Olympiads. To draw a picture even for this date, we possess no authentic materials, and are obliged to antedate statements which belong to a later age: and this consideration might alone suffice to show how uncertified are all delineations of the Greece of 1183 B.C., the supposed epoch of the Trojan war, four centuries earlier.

¹ Herodot. i. 143-150.

CHAPTER II.

THE HELLENIC PEOPLE GENERALLY, IN THE EARLY HISTORICAL TIMES.

THE territory indicated in the last chapter—south of Mount Olympus, and south of the line which connects the city of Ambrakia with Mount Pindus,—was occupied during the historical period by the central stock of the Hellenes or Greeks, from which their numerous outlying colonies were planted out.

Both metropolitans and colonists styled themselves Hellenes, and were recognised as such by each other: all glorying in the name as the prominent symbol of fraternity,—all describing non-Hellenic men or cities by a word which involved associations of repugnance. Our term *barbarian*, borrowed from this latter word, does not express the same idea; for the Greeks spoke thus indiscriminately of the extra-Hellenic world with all its inhabitants,¹ whatever might be the gentleness of their character, and whatever might be their degree of civilization. The rulers and people of Egyptian Thebes with their ancient and gigantic monuments, the wealthy Tyrians and Carthaginians, the phil-Hellene Arganthonius of Tartessus, and the well-disciplined patricians of Rome (to the indignation of old Cato),² were all comprised in it. At first it seemed to have expressed more of repugnance than of contempt, and repugnance especially towards the sound of a foreign language.³ Afterwards

The Hellenes generally.—Barbarians—the word used as antithesis to Hellenes.

¹ See the protest of Eratosthenês against the continuance of the classification into Greek and Barbarian, after the latter word had come to imply rudeness (ap. Strabo. ii. p. 66; Eratosth. Fragm. Seidel. p. 85).

² Cato, Fragment. ed. Lion. p. 46: ap. Plin. H. N. xxii. 1. A remarkable extract from Cato's letter to his son, intimating his strong antipathy to the Greeks; he proscribes their medicine altogether, and admits only a slight taste of their literature:—"quod bonum sit eorum literas inspicere, non perdisserere. . . Jurarunt inter se, Barbaros necare omnes medicinâ, sed hoc ipsum

mercede faciunt, ut fides iis sit et facile disperdant. Nos quoque dictitant Barbaros et spurios, nosque magis quam alios, Opicos appellatione fedant."

³ Καρῶν ἡγήσατο βαρβαροφάνων, Homer, Iliad, ii. 867. Homer does not use the word *βάρβαροι*, or any words signifying either a Hellen generally or a non-Hellen generally (Thucyd. i. 3). Compare Strabo, viii. p. 370; and xiv. p. 662.

Ovid reproduces the primitive sense of the word *βάρβαρος* when he speaks of himself as an exile at Tomi (Trist. v. 10-37):—

"Barbarus hic ego sum, quia non intelligor ulli."

a feeling of their own superior intelligence (in part well-justified) arose among the Greeks, and their term *barbarian* was used so as to imply a low state of the temper and intelligence; in which sense it was retained by the semi-hellenised Romans, as the proper antithesis to their state of civilization. The want of a suitable word, corresponding to *barbarian* as the Greeks originally used it, is so inconvenient in the description of Grecian phænomena and sentiments, that I may be obliged occasionally to use the word in its primitive sense.

The Hellenes were all of common blood and parentage,—were all descendants of the common patriarch Hellen. In treating of the historical Greeks, we have to accept this as a datum: it represents the sentiment under the influence of which they moved and acted. It is placed by Herodotus in the front rank, as the chief of those four ties which bound together the Hellenic aggregate: 1. Fellowship of blood; 2. Fellowship of language; 3. Fixed domiciles of gods, and sacrifices, common to all; 4. Like manners and dispositions.

Hellenic
aggregate—
how held
together.
1. Fellow-
ship of blood.

These (say the Athenians in their reply to the Spartan envoys, in the very crisis of the Persian invasion) “Athens will never disgrace herself by betraying.” And Zeus Hellenius was recognised as the god watching over and enforcing the fraternity thus constituted.¹

Hekataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides,² all believed that there had been an ante-Hellenic period, when different languages, mutually unintelligible, were spoken between Mount Olympus and Cape Malea. However this may be, during the historical times the Greek language was universal throughout these limits—branching out however into a great variety of dialects, which were roughly classified by later literary men into Ionic, Doric, Æolic, and Attic. But the classification presents a semblance of regularity, which in point of fact does not seem to have been

2. Common
language.

The Egyptians had a word in their language the exact equivalent of *βάρβαρος* in this sense (Herod. ii. 158).

¹ Herod. viii. 144. . . τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὼν ὁμαίον τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι, ἥθεα τε ὁμότροπα: τῶν προδότης γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εἶ ἔχοι. (Ib. ix. 7.) Ἡμεῖς δὲ, Δία τε Ἑλληνιον αἰδεσθέντες, καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δεινὸν ποιούμενοι προδούναι, &c.

Compare Dikæarch. Fragn. p. 147, ed. Fuhr.; and Thucyd. iii. 59—τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμιμα . . . θεοὺς τοὺς ὁμοβωμίους καὶ κοινούς τῶν Ἑλλήνων: also

the provision about the κοινὰ ἱερὰ in the treaty between Sparta and Athens (Thuc. v. 18; Strabo, ix. p. 419).

It was a part of the proclamation solemnly made by the Eumolpidæ, prior to the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries, “All non-Hellens to keep away”—εἰργεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν (Isocrates, Orat. iv. Panegy. p. 74).

² Hekataei. Fragn. 356, ed. Klausen: compare Strabo, vii. p. 321; Herod. i. 57; Thucyd. i. 3—κατὰ πόλεις τε, ὅσοι ἀλλήλων συνίεσαν, &c.

realised; each town, each smaller subdivision of the Hellenic name, having peculiarities of dialect belonging to itself. Now the lettered men who framed the quadruple division took notice chiefly, if not exclusively, of the written dialects,—those which had been ennobled by poets or other authors; the mere spoken idioms were for the most part neglected.¹ That there was no such thing as one Ionic dialect in the speech of the people called Ionic Greeks, we know from the indisputable testimony of Herodotus,² who tells us that there were four capital varieties of speech among the twelve Asiatic towns especially known as Ionic. Of course the varieties would have been much more numerous if he had given us the impressions of his ear in Eubœa, the Cyclades, Massalia, Rhegium, and Olbia,—all numbered as Greeks and as Ionians. The Ionic dialect of the grammarians was an extract from Homer, Hekataëus, Herodotus, Hippokrates, &c.; to what living speech it made the nearest approach, amidst those divergencies which the historian has made known to us, we cannot tell. Sapphô and Alkæus in Lesbos, Myrtis and Korinna in Bœotia, were the great sources of reference for the Lesbian and Bœotian varieties of the Æolic dialect—of which there was a third variety, untouched by the poets, in Thesaly.³ The analogy between the different manifestations of Doric and Æolic, as well as that between the Doric generally and the Æolic generally, contrasted with the Attic, is only to be taken as rough and approximative.

Greek language essentially one with a variety of dialects.

But all these different dialects are nothing more than dialects, distinguished as modifications of one and the same language, and exhibiting evidence of certain laws and principles pervading them all. They seem capable of being traced back to a certain ideal mother-language, peculiar in itself and distinguishable from, though cognate with, the Latin; a substantive member of what has been called the Indo-European family of languages. This truth has been brought out in recent times by the comparative examination applied to the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, German, and Lithuanian languages, as well as by the more accurate analysis of the Greek language itself to which such

¹ "Antiqui grammatici eas tantum dialectos spectabant, quibus scriptores uti essent: ceteras, quæ non vigeant nisi in ore populi, non notabant." (Ahrens, *De Dialecto Æolicâ*, p. 2.) The same has been the case, to a great degree, even in the linguistic researches of modern times, though printing now

affords such increased facility for the registration of popular dialects.

² Herod. i. 142.

³ Respecting the three varieties of the Æolic dialect, differing considerably from each other, see the valuable work of Ahrens, *De Dial. Æol.* sect. 2, 32, 50.

studies have given rise, in a manner much more clear than could have been imagined by the ancients themselves.¹ It is needless to dwell upon the importance of this uniformity of language in holding together the race, and in rendering the genius of its most favoured members available to the civilization of all. Except in the rarest cases, the divergencies of dialect were not such as to prevent every Greek from understanding, and being understood by, every other Greek,—a fact remarkable when we consider how many of their outlying colonists, not having taken out women in their emigration, intermarried with non-Hellenic wives. And the perfection and popularity of their early epic poems was here of inestimable value for the diffusion of a common type of language, and for thus keeping together the sympathies of the Hellenic world.² The Homeric dialect became the standard followed by all Greek poets for the Hexameter, as may be seen particularly from the example of Hesiod—who adheres to it in the main, though his father was a native of the Æolic Kymê, and he himself resident at Askra, in the Æolic Bœotia—and the early Iambic and Elegiac compositions are framed on the same model. Intellectual Greeks in all cities, even the most distant outcasts from the central hearth, became early accustomed to one type of literary speech, and possessors of a common stock of legends, maxims, and metaphors.

That community of religious sentiments, localities, and sacrifices, which Herodotus names as the third bond of union among the Greeks, was a phænomenon not (like the race and the language) interwoven with their primitive constitution, but of gradual growth. In the time of Herodotus, and even a century earlier, it was at its full maturity; but there had been a period when no religious meetings common to the whole Hellenic body existed. What are called the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games (the four most conspicuous amidst many others analogous) were in reality great religious festivals—for the gods then gave their special sanction, name, and presence, to recreative meetings—the closest association then prevailed between the feelings of common worship and the sympathy in common amusement.³ Though this association is now no longer recog-

3. Common religious sentiments, localities, and sacrifices.

¹ The work of Albert Giese, *Ueber den Æolischen Dialekt* (unhappily not finished, on account of the early death of the author), presents an ingenious specimen of such analysis.

² See the interesting remarks of Dio Chrysostom on the attachment of the inhabitants of Olbia (or Borysthenes) to

the Homeric poems: most of them, he says, could repeat the *Iliad* by heart, though their dialect was partially barbarised, and the city in a sad state of ruin (Dio Chrysost. *Orat.* xxxvi. p. 78, Reisk.).

³ Plato, *Legg.* ii. l. p. 656; Kratylus, p. 406; and Dionys. Hal. *Ars Rhetoric.*

nised, it is nevertheless essential that we should keep it fully before us, if we desire to understand the life and proceedings of the Greeks. To Herodotus and his contemporaries, these great festivals, then frequented by crowds from every part of Greece, were of overwhelming importance and interest; yet they had once been purely local, attracting no visitors except from a very narrow neighbourhood. In the Homeric poems much is said about the common gods, and about special places consecrated to and occupied by several of them; the chiefs celebrate funeral games in honour of a deceased father, which are visited by competitors from different parts of Greece, but nothing appears to manifest public or town festivals open to Grecian visitors generally.¹ And though the rocky Pytho with its temple stands out in the Iliad as a place both venerated and rich—the Pythian games, under the superintendence of the Amphiktyons, with continuous enrolment of victors and a Pan-Hellenic reputation, do not begin until after the Sacred War, in the 48th Olympiad, or 586 B.C.²

The Olympic games, more conspicuous than the Pythian as well as considerably older, are also remarkable on another ground, inasmuch as they supplied historical computers with the oldest backward record of continuous time. It was in the year 776 B.C. that the Eleians inscribed the name of their countryman Korœbus as victor in the competition of runners, and that they began the practice of inscribing in like manner, in each Olympic or fifth recurring year, the name of the runner who won the prize. Even for a long time after this, however, the Olympic games seem

c. 1-2. p. 226—Θεὸς μὲν γέ που πάντως πάσης ἡστινosoῦν πανηγύρεως ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἐπώνυμος· οἶον Ὀλυμπίων μὲν, Ὀλύμπιος Ζεὺς· τοῦ δ' ἐν Πυθοί, Ἀπολλών.

Apollo, the Muses, and Dionysus are *ἐυνεορτασταὶ καὶ ἐυγχορευταὶ* (Homer, Hymn to Apoll. 146). The same view of the sacred games is given by Livy in reference to the Romans and the Volsci (ii. 36-37):—"Se, ut consceleratos contaminatosque, ab ludis, festis diebus, cœtu quodammodo hominum Deorumque, abactos esse . . . ideo nos ab sede picum, cœtu, concilioque abigi." It is curious to contrast this with the dislike and repugnance of Tertullian:—"Idololatria omnium ludorum mater est—quod enim spectaculum sine idolo, quis ludus sine sacrificio?" (De Spectaculis, p. 369.)

¹ Iliad, xxiii. 630-679. The games celebrated by Akastus in honour of Pelias were famed in the old epic (Pausan.

v. 17, 4; Apollodôr. i. 9, 28).

² Strabo, ix. p. 421; Pausan. x. 7, 3. The first Pythian games celebrated by the Amphiktyons after the Sacred War carried with them a substantial reward to the victor (an *ἀγὼν χρηματίας*); but in the next or second Pythian games nothing was given but an honorary reward or wreath of laurel leaves (*ἀγὼν στεφανίας*): the first coincide with Olympiad 48, 3; the second with Olympiad 49, 3.

Compare Schol. ad Pindar. Pyth. Argument.: Pausan. x. 37, 45; Krause, Die Pythien, Nemeen, und Isthmien, sect. 3, 4, 5.

The Homeric Hymn to Apollo is composed at a time earlier than the Sacred War, when Krissa is flourishing; earlier than the Pythian games as celebrated by the Amphiktyons.

to have remained a local festival; the prize being uniformly carried off, at the first twelve Olympiads, by some competitor either of Elis or its immediate neighbourhood. The Nemean and Isthmian games did not become notorious or frequented until later even than the Pythian. Solôn¹ in his legislation proclaimed the large reward of 500 drachms for every Athenian who gained an Olympic prize, and the lower sum of 100 drachms for an Isthmiac prize. He counts the former as Pan-Hellenic rank and renown, an ornament even to the city of which the victor was a member—the latter as partial and confined to the neighbourhood.

Of the beginnings of these great solemnities we cannot presume to speak, except in mythical language: we know them only in their comparative maturity. But the habit of common sacrifice, on a small scale and between near neighbours, is a part of the earliest habits of Greece. The sentiment of fraternity, between two tribes or villages, first manifested itself by sending a sacred legation or *Theôria*² to offer sacrifices at each other's festivals and to partake in the recreations which followed; thus establishing a truce with solemn guarantee, and bringing themselves into direct connexion each with the god of the other under his appropriate local surname. The pacific communion so fostered, and the increased assurance of intercourse, as Greece gradually emerged from the turbulence and pugnacity of the heroic age, operated especially in extending the range of this ancient habit: the village festivals

Habit of common sacrifice an early feature of the Hellenic mind—began on a small scale.

¹ Plutarch, Solôn, 23. The Isthmian Agôn was to a certain extent a festival of old Athenian origin; for among the many legends respecting its first institution, one of the most notorious represented it as having been founded by Theseus after his victory over Sinis at the Isthmus (See Schol. ad Pindar. Isthm. Argument.; Pausan. ii. 1, 4), or over Skeirôn (Plutarch, Theseus, c. 25. Plutarch says that they were first established by Theseus as funeral games for Skeirôn, and Pliny gives the same story (H. N. vii. 57). According to Hellanikus, the Athenian Theôrs at the Isthmian games had a privileged place (Plutarch, *l. c.*).

There is therefore good reason why Solôn should single out the Isthmionikæ as persons to be specially rewarded, not mentioning the Pythionikæ and Nemeonikæ—the Nemean and Pythian games not having then acquired Hellenic importance. Diogenes Laërt. (i. 55) says that Solôn provided rewards, not only

for victories at the Olympic and Isthmian, but also ἀνάλογον ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, which Krause (Pythien, Nemeen und Isthmien, sect. 3, p. 13) supposes to be the truth; I think, very improbably. The sharp invective of Timokreon against Themistocles, charging him among other things with providing nothing but cold meat at the Isthmian games (Ἰσθμοῖ δ' ἐπαυδόκευ γελοῖως ψυχρὰ κρέα παρέχων, Plutarch, Themistoc. c. 21), seems to imply that the Athenian visitors, whom the Theôrs were called upon to take care of at those games, were numerous.

² In many Grecian states (as at Ægina, Mantinea, Trœzen, Thasos, &c.) these Theôrs formed a permanent college, and seem to have been invested with extensive functions in reference to religious ceremonies: at Athens they were chosen for the special occasion (see Thucyd. v. 47; Aristotel. Polit. v. 8, 3; O. Müller, Æginetica, p. 135; Demosthen. de Fals. Leg. p. 380).

became town festivals, largely frequented by the citizens of other towns, and sometimes with special invitations sent round to attract Theôrs from every Hellenic community,—and thus these once humble assemblages gradually swelled into the pomp and immense confluence of the Olympic and Pythian games. The city administering such holy ceremonies enjoyed inviolability of territory during the month of their occurrence, being itself under obligation at that time to refrain from all aggression, as well as to notify by heralds¹ the commencement of the truce to all other cities not in avowed hostility with it. Elis imposed heavy fines upon other towns—even on the powerful Lacedæmon—for violation of the Olympic truce, on pain of exclusion from the festival in case of non-payment.

Sometimes this tendency to religious fraternity took a form called an Amphiktyony, different from the common festival. A certain number of towns entered into an exclusive religious partnership, for the celebration of sacrifices periodically to the god of a particular temple, which was supposed to be the common property and under the common protection of all, though one of the number was often named as permanent administrator; while all other Greeks were excluded. That there were many religious partnerships of this sort, which have never acquired a place in history, among the early Grecian villages, we may perhaps gather from the etymology of the word (Amphiktyons² designates residents around, or neighbours, considered in the point of view of fellow-religionists), as well as from the indications preserved to us in reference to various parts of the country. Thus there was an Amphiktyony³ of seven cities at the holy island of Kalauria, close to the harbour of Trœzen. Hermionê, Epidaurus, Ægina, Athens, Prasiæ, Nauplia, and Orchomenus, jointly maintained the temple and sanctuary of Poseidôn in that island (with which it would seem that the city of Trœzen, though close at hand, had no connexion), meeting there at stated periods, to offer formal sacrifices. These seven cities indeed were not immediate neighbours, but the speciality and exclusiveness of their interest in the temple is seen from the fact, that when the

¹ About the sacred truce, Olympian, Isthmian, &c., formally announced by two heralds crowned with garlands sent from the administering city, and with respect to which many tricks were played, see Thucyd. v. 49; Xenophon, Hellen. iv. 7, 1-7; Plutarch, Lycurg.

23; Pindar, Isthm. ii. 35.—σπονδοφόροι—κάρνυες ὥραν—Thucyd. viii. 9-10 is also peculiarly instructive in regard to the practice and the feeling.

² Pindar, Isthm. iii. 26 (iv. 14); Nem. vi. 40.

³ Strabo, viii. p. 374.

Argeians took Nauplia, they adopted and fulfilled these religious obligations on behalf of the prior inhabitants: so also did the Lacedæmonians when they had captured Prasizæ. Again in Triphylia,¹ situated between the Pisatid and Messenia in the western part of Peloponnesus, there was a similar religious meeting and partnership of the Triphylians on Cape Samikon, at the temple of the Samian Poseidôn. Here the inhabitants of Makiston were entrusted with the details of superintendence, as well as with the duty of notifying beforehand the exact time of meeting (a precaution essential amidst the diversities and irregularities of the Greek calendar), and also of proclaiming what was called the Samian truce—a temporary abstinence from hostilities which bound all Triphylians during the holy period. This latter custom discloses the salutary influence of such institutions in presenting to men's minds a common object of reverence, common duties, and common enjoyments; thus generating sympathies and feelings of mutual obligation amidst petty communities not less fierce than suspicious.² So too, the twelve chief Ionic cities in and near Asia-Minor had their Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony peculiar to themselves: the six Doric cities, in and near the southern corner of that peninsula, combined for the like purpose at the temple of the Triopian Apollo; and the feeling of special partnership is here particularly illustrated by the fact, that Halikarnassus, one of the six, was formally extruded by the remaining five in consequence of a violation of the rules.³ There was also an Amphiktyonic union at Onchêstus in Bœotia, in the venerated grove and temple at Poseidôn:⁴ of whom it consisted we are not informed. These are some specimens of the sort of special religious conventions and assemblies which seem to have been frequent

Their beneficial influence in creating sympathies.

¹ Strabo, viii. p. 343; Pausan. v. 6, 1.

² At Iolkos, on the north coast of the Gulf of Pagasæ, and at the borders of the Magnètes, Thessalians, and Achæans of Phthiôtis, was celebrated a periodical religious festival or panegyris, the title of which we are prevented from making out by the imperfection of Strabo's text (Strabo, ix. 436). It stands in the text as printed in Tzschucke's edition, 'Εν ταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὴν Πυλαϊκὴν πανήγυριν συνετέλουν. The mention of Πυλαϊκὴ πανήγυρις, which conducts us only to the Amphiktyonic convocations of Thermopylæ and Delphi, is here unsuitable; and the best or Parisian MS. of Strabo presents a gap (one among the many which embarrass the ninth book) in the

place of the word Πυλαϊκὴν. Dutheil conjectures τὴν Πελλιακὴν πανήγυριν, deriving the name from the celebrated funeral games of the old epic celebrated by Akastus in honour of his father Pelias. Grosskurd (in his note on the passage) approves the conjecture, but it seems to me not probable that a Grecian panegyris would be named after Pelias. Πηλιακὴν, in reference to the neighbouring mountain and town of Pelion, might perhaps be less objectionable (see Dikæarch. Fragm. p. 407-409, ed. Fuhr.), but we cannot determine with certainty.

³ Herod. i.; Dionys. Hal. iv. 25.

⁴ Strabo, ix. p. 412; Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 232.

throughout Greece. Nor ought we to omit those religious meetings and sacrifices which were common to all the members of one Hellenic subdivision, such as the Pam-Bœotia to all the Bœotians, celebrated at the temple of the Itonian Athênê near Korôneia¹—the common observances, rendered to the temple of Apollo Pythæus at Argos, by all those neighbouring towns which had once been attached by this religious thread to the Argeians—the similar periodical ceremonies, frequented by all who bore the Achæan or Ætolian name—and the splendid and exhilarating festivals, so favourable to the diffusion of the early Grecian poetry, which brought all Ionians at stated intervals to the sacred island of Delos.² This latter class of festivals agreed with the Amphiktyony in being of a special and exclusive character, not open to all Greeks.

But there was one amongst these many Amphiktyonies, which, though starting from the smallest beginnings, gradually expanded into so comprehensive a character, and acquired so marked a predominance over the rest, as to be called The Amphiktyonic assembly, and even to have been mistaken by some authors for a sort of federal Hellenic Diet. Twelve sub-races, out of the number which made up entire Hellas, belonged to this ancient Amphiktyony, the meetings of which were held twice in every year: in spring at the temple of Apollo at Delphi; in autumn at Thermopylæ, in the sacred precinct of Dêmêtêr Amphiktyonis. Sacred deputies, including a chief called the Hieromnêmôn and subordinates called the Pylagoræ, attended at these meetings from each of the twelve races: a crowd of volunteers seem to have accompanied them, for purposes of sacrifice, trade, or enjoyment. Their special, and most important function, consisted in watching over the Delphian temple, in which all the twelve sub-races had a joint interest, and it was the immense wealth and national ascendancy of this temple which enhanced to so great a pitch the dignity of its acknowledged administrators.

The twelve constituent members were as follow:—Thessalians, Bœotians, Dorians, Ionians, Perrhæbians, Magnêtes, Lokrians, Cêtæans, Achæans, Phokians, Dolopes, and Malians.³ All are

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 411.

² Thucyd. iii. 104; v. 55. Pausan. vii. 7, 1; 24, 3. Polyb. v. 8; ii. 54. Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 146.

According to what seems to have been the ancient and sacred tradition, the whole of the month Karneius was a time of peace among the Dorians; though

this was often neglected in practice at the time of the Peloponnesian war (Thuc. v. 54). But it may be doubted whether there was any festival of Karneia common to all the Dorians: the Karneia at Sparta seems to have been a Lacedæmonian festival.

³ The list of the Amphiktyonic con-

counted as *races* (if we treat the Hellenes as a race, we must call these *sub-races*), no mention being made of cities: ¹ all count equally in respect to voting, two votes being given by the deputies from each of the twelve: moreover, we are told that in determining the deputies to be sent, or the manner in which the votes of each race should be given, the powerful Athens, Sparta, and Thebes, had no more influence than the humblest Ionian, Dorian, or Bœotian city. This latter fact is distinctly stated by Æschines, himself a Pylagore sent to Delphi by Athens. And so, doubtless, the theory of the case stood: the votes of the Ionic races counted for neither more nor less than two, whether given by deputies from Athens, or from the small towns of Erythræ and Priênê; and in like manner the Dorian votes were as good in the division, when given by deputies from Bœon and Kytinion in the little territory of Doris, as if the men delivering them had been Spartans. But there can be as little question that in practice the little Ionic cities and the little Doric cities pretended to no share in the Amphihtyonic deliberations. As the Ionic vote came to be substantially the vote of Athens, so, if Sparta was ever obstructed in the management of the Doric vote, it must have been by powerful Doric cities like Argos or Corinth, not by the insignificant towns of Doris. But the theory of Amphihtyonic suffrage as laid down by Æschines, however little realised in practice during his day, is important inasmuch as it shows in full evidence the primitive and original constitution. The first establishment of the Amphihtyonic convocation dates from a time when all the twelve members were on a footing of equal independence, and when there were no overwhelming cities (such as Sparta and Athens) to cast in the shade the humbler members—when Sparta was only one Doric city, and Athens only one Ionic city, among various others of consideration not much inferior.

There are also other proofs which show the high antiquity of this Amphihtyonic convocation. Æschines gives us an extract from the oath which had been taken by the sacred deputies who attended on behalf of their respective races, ever since its first establishment, and which still apparently

Its twelve constituent members, and their mutual position.

Antiquity of the Council—simplicity of the old oath.

stituency is differently given by Æschines, by Harpokration, and by Pausanias. Tittmann (Ueber den Amphihtyonicen Bund, sect. 3, 4, 5) analyses and compares their various statements, and elicits the catalogue given in the text.

¹ Æschines, de Fals. Legat. p. 280. c. 36.—Κατηριθμησάμην δὲ ἔθνη δώδεκα, τὰ μετέχοντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ . . . καὶ τούτων ἕδειξε ἕκαστον ἔθνος, ἰσόψηφον γενόμενον, τὸ μέγιστον τῷ ἐλάττωι, &c.

continued to be taken in his day. The antique simplicity of this oath, and of the conditions to which the members bind themselves, betrays the early age in which it originated, as well as the humble resources of those towns to which it was applied.¹ "We will not destroy any Amphiktyonic town—we will not cut off any Amphiktyonic town from running water"—such are the two prominent obligations which Æschines specifies out of the old oath. The second of the two carries us back to the simplest state of society, and to towns of the smallest size, when the maidens went out with their basins to fetch water from the spring, like the daughters of Keleos at Eleusis, or those of Athens from the fountain Kallirrhoê.² We may even conceive that the special mention of this detail, in the covenant between the twelve races, is borrowed literally from agreements still earlier, among the villages or little towns in which the members of each race were distributed. At any rate, it proves satisfactorily the very ancient date to which the commencement of the Amphiktyonic convocation must be referred. The belief of Æschines (perhaps also the belief general in his time) was, that it commenced simultaneously with the first foundation of the Delphian temple—an event of which we have no historical knowledge; but there seems reason to suppose that its original establishment is connected with Thermopylæ and Dêmêtêr Amphiktyonis, rather than with Delphi and Apollo. The special surname by which Dêmêtêr and her temple at Thermopylæ was known³—the temple of the hero Amphiktyon which stood at its side—the word Pylæa, which obtained footing in the language to designate the half-yearly meeting of the deputies both at Thermopylæ and at Delphi—these indications point to Thermopylæ (the real central point for all the twelve) as the primary place of meeting, and to the Delphian half-year as something secondary and superadded. On such a matter, however, we cannot go beyond a conjecture.

Amphiktyonic meeting originally at Thermopylæ.

The hero Amphiktyon, whose temple stood at Thermopylæ, passed in mythical genealogy for the brother of Hellên. And it may be affirmed, with truth, that the habit of forming Amphiktyonic unions, and of frequenting each other's religious festivals, was the great means of creating

Valuable influence of these Amphiktyonies and festivals in promoting Hellenic union.

¹ Æschin. Fals. Legat. p. 279, c. 35:—"Ἀμα δὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς διεξῆλθον τὴν κτίσιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ τὴν πρώτην σύνοδον γενομένην τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων, καὶ τοὺς ὄρκους αὐτῶν ἀνέγνω, ἐν οἷς ἐνορκεῖν ἦν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις μηδεμίαν πόλιν τῶν Ἀμφι-

κτυονίδων ἀνάστατον ποιήσειν μηδ' ὑδάτων ναματιαίων εἶρξιν, &c.

² Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 457. Homer, *Hymn to Dêmêtêr*, 100, 107, 170. Herodot. vi. 137. Thucyd. ii. 15.

³ Herodot. vii. 200; Livy, xxxi. 32.

and fostering the primitive feeling of brotherhood among the children of Hellên, in those early times when rudeness, insecurity, and pugnacity did so much to isolate them. A certain number of salutary habits and sentiments, such as that which the Amphihtyonic oath embodies, in regard to abstinence from injury as well as to mutual protection,¹ gradually found their way into men's minds: the obligations thus brought into play acquired a substantive efficacy of their own, and the religious feeling which always remained connected with them, came afterwards to be only one out of many complex agencies by which the later historical Greek was moved. Athens and Sparta in the days of their might, and the inferior cities in relation to them, played each their own political game, in which religious considerations will be found to bear only a subordinate part.

The special function of the Amphihtyonic council, so far as we know it, consisted in watching over the safety, the interests, and the treasures of the Delphian temple. "If any one shall plunder the property of the god, or shall be cognizant thereof, or shall take treacherous counsel against the things in the temple, we will punish him with foot, and hand, and voice, and by every means in our power." So ran the old Amphihtyonic oath, with an energetic imprecation attached to it.² And there are some examples in which the council³ construes its functions so largely as to receive and adjudicate upon complaints against entire cities, for offences against the religious and patriotic sentiment of the Greeks generally. But for the most part its interference relates directly to the Delphian temple. The earliest case in which it is brought to our view is the Sacred War against Kirrha, in the 46th Olympiad or 595 B.C., conducted by

Amphihtyons had the superintendence of the temple of Delphi;

¹ The festival of the Amarynthia in Eubœa, held at the temple of Artemis of Amarynthus, was frequented by the Ionic Chalkis and Eretria as well as by the Dryopic Karystus. In a combat proclaimed between Chalkis and Eretria, to settle the question about the possession of the plain of Lelantum, it was stipulated that no missile weapons should be used by either party; this agreement was inscribed and recorded in the temple of Artemis (Strabo, x. p. 448; Livy, xxxv. 38).

² Æschin. De Fals. Legat. c. 35. p. 279: compare adv. Ktesiphont. c. 36. p. 406.

³ See the charge which Æschines alleges to have been brought by the

Lokrians of Amphissa against Athens in the Amphihtyonic Council (adv. Ktesiphont. c. 38. p. 409). Demosthenes contradicts his rival as to the fact of the charge having been brought, saying that the Amphisæans had not given the notice, customary and required, of their intention to bring it: a reply which admits that the charge *might* be brought (Demosth. de Coronâ, c. 43. p. 277).

The Amphihtyons offer a reward for the life of Ephialtes, the betrayer of the Greeks at Thermopylæ; they also erect columns to the memory of the fallen Greeks in that memorable strait, the place of their half-yearly meeting (Herod. vii. 213-228).

Eurylochos the Thessalian, and Kleisthenes of Sikyôn, and proposed by Solôn of Athens:¹ we find the Amphiktyons also about half a century afterwards undertaking the duty of collecting subscriptions throughout the Hellenic world, and making the contract with the Alkmæonids for rebuilding the temple after a conflagration.² But the influence of this council is essentially of a fluctuating and intermittent character. Sometimes it appears forward to decide, and its decisions command respect; but such occasions are rare, taking the general course of known Grecian history; while there are other occasions, and those too especially affecting the Delphian temple, on which we are surprised to find nothing said about it. In the long and perturbed period which Thucydidês describes, he never once mentions the Amphiktyons, though the temple and the safety of its treasures form the repeated subject³ as well of dispute as of express stipulation between Athens and Sparta. Moreover, among the twelve constituent members of the council, we find three—the Perrhæbians, the Magnêtes, and the Achæans of Phthia—who were not even independent, but subject to the Thessalians; so that its meetings, when they were not matters of mere form, probably expressed only the feelings of the three or four leading members. When one or more of these great powers had a party purpose to accomplish against others—when Philip of Macedon wished to extrude one of the members in order to procure admission for himself—it became convenient to turn this ancient form into a serious reality: and we shall see the Athenian Æschines providing a pretext for Philip to meddle in favour of the minor Bœotian cities against Thebes, by alleging that these cities were under the protection of the old Amphiktyonic oath.⁴

It is thus that we have to consider the council as an element in Grecian affairs—an ancient institution, one amongst many instances of the primitive habit of religious fraternisation, but wider and more comprehensive than the rest—at first purely religious,

¹ Æschin. adv. Ktesiph. l. c. Plutarch, Solôn, c. xi., who refers to Aristotle *ἐν τῇ τῶν Πυθιονικῶν ἀναγραφῇ*—Pausan. x. 37, 4; Schol. ad Pindar. Nem. ix. 2. Τὰς Ἀμφικτυονικὰς δίκας, ὅσαι πόλεσι πρὸς πόλεις εἰσὶν (Strabo, ix. p. 420). These Amphiktyonic arbitrations, however, are of rare occurrence in history, and very commonly abused.

² Herodot. ii. 180, v. 62.

³ Thucyd. i. 112, iv. 118, v. 18. The Phokians in the Sacred War (B.C. 354)

pretended that they had an ancient and prescriptive right to the administration of the Delphian temple, under accountability to the general body of Greeks for the proper employment of its possessions—thus setting aside the Amphiktyons altogether (Diodor. xvi. 27).

⁴ Æschin. de Fals. Legat. p. 280. c. 36. The party intrigues which moved the council in regard to the Sacred War against the Phokians (B.C. 355) may be seen in Diodorus, xvi. 23–28 seq.

then religious and political at once, lastly more the latter than the former—highly valuable in the infancy, but unsuited to the maturity of Greece, and called into real working only on rare occasions, when its efficiency happened to fall in with the views of Athens, Thebes, or the king of Macedon. In such special moments it shines with a transient light which affords a partial pretence for the imposing title bestowed on it by Cicero—"commune Græciæ concilium;"¹ but we should completely misinterpret Grecian history if we regarded it as a federal council habitually directing or habitually obeyed. Had there existed any such "commune concilium" of tolerable wisdom and patriotism, and had the tendencies of the Hellenic mind been capable of adapting themselves to it, the whole course of later Grecian history would probably have been altered; the Macedonian kings would have remained only as respectable neighbours, borrowing civilization from Greece and expending their military energies upon Thracians and Illyrians; while united Hellas might even have maintained her own territory against the conquering legions of Rome.

The twelve constituent Amphiktyonic races remained unchanged until the Sacred War against the Phokians (B.C. 355), after which, though the number twelve was continued, the Phokians were disfranchised, and their votes transferred to Philip of Macedon. It has been already mentioned that these twelve did not exhaust the whole of Hellas. Arcadians, Eleans, Pisans, ^{Many Hellenic states had no participation in it.} Minyæ, Dryopes, Ætolians, all genuine Hellens, are not comprehended in it; but all of them had a right to make use of the temple of Delphi, and to contend in the Pythian and Olympic games. The Pythian games, celebrated near Delphi, were under the superintendence of the Amphiktyons,² or of some acting magistrate chosen by and presumed to represent them. Like the Olympic games, they came round every four years (the interval between one celebration and another being four complete years, which the Greeks called a Pentaetêris): the Isthmian and Nemean games recurred every two years. In its first humble form of a competition among bards to sing a hymn in praise of Apollo, this festival was doubtless of immemorial antiquity;³ but

¹ Cicero, *De Invention*, ii. 23. The representation of Dionysius of Halikarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* iv. 25) overshoots the reality still more.

About the common festivals and Amphiktyonies of the Hellenic world generally, see Wachsmuth, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*, vol. i. sect. 22, 24, 25;

also C. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalterthümer*, sect. 11-13.

² Plutarch, *Sympos.* vii. 5, 1.

³ In this early phase of the Pythian festival, it is said to have been celebrated every eight years, marking what we should call an Octaetêris, and what the early Greeks called an Ennaetêris

the first extension of it into Pan-Hellenic notoriety (as I have already remarked), the first multiplication of the subjects of competition, and the first introduction of a continuous record of the conquerors, date only from the time when it came under the presidency of the Amphiktyons, at the close of the Sacred War against Kirrha. What is called the first Pythian contest coincides with the third year of the 48th Olympiad, or 585 B.C. From that period forward the games become crowded and celebrated: but the date just named, nearly two centuries after the first Olympiad, is a proof that the habit of periodical frequentation of festivals, by numbers and from distant parts, grew up but slowly in the Grecian world.

The foundation of the temple of Delphi itself reaches far beyond all historical knowledge, forming one of the aboriginal institutions of Hellas. It is a sanctified and wealthy place even in the *Iliad*: the legislation of Lykurgus at Sparta is introduced under its auspices, and the earliest Grecian colonies, those of Sicily and Italy in the eighth century B.C., are established in consonance with its mandate. Delphi and Dodona appear, in the most ancient circumstances of Greece, as universally venerated oracles and sanctuaries: and Delphi not only receives honours and donations, but also answers questions, from Lydians, Phrygians, Etruscans, Romans, &c.: it is not exclusively Hellenic. One of the valuable services which a Greek looked for from this and other great religious establishments was, that it should resolve his doubts in cases of perplexity—that it should advise him whether to begin a new, or to persist in an old project—that it should foretell what would be his fate under given circumstances, and inform him, if suffering under distress, on what conditions the

(Censorinus, *De Die Natali*, c. 18). This period is one of considerable importance in reference to the principle of the Grecian calendar, for 99 lunar months coincide very nearly with eight solar years. The discovery of this coincidence is ascribed by Censorinus to Kleostratus of Tenedos, whose age is not directly known; he must be anterior to Meton, who discovered the cycle of nineteen solar years, but (I imagine) not much anterior. In spite of the authority of Ideler, it seems to me not proved, nor can I believe, that this octennial period with its solar and lunar coincidence was known to the Greeks in the earliest times of their mythical antiquity, or before the year 600 B.C. See

Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. i. p. 366; vol. ii. p. 607. The practice of the Eleians to celebrate the Olympic games alternately after forty-nine and fifty lunar months, though attested for a later time by the Scholiast on Pindar, is not proved to be old. The fact that there were ancient octennial recurring festivals does not establish a knowledge of the properties of the octaeteric or enneateric period: nor does it seem to me that the details of the Bæotian *δαφνηφορία*, described in Proclus ap. Photium, sect. 239, are very ancient. See on the old mythical Octaetêris, O. Müller, *Orchomenos*, p. 218 *seqq.*, and Krause, *Die Pythien, Nemeen, und Isthmien*, sect. 4. p. 22.

gods would grant him relief. The three priestesses of Dodona with their venerable oak, and the priestess of Delphi sitting on her tripod under the influence of a certain gas or vapour exhaling from the rock, were alike competent to determine these difficult points: and we shall have constant occasion to notice in this history, with what complete faith both the question was put and the answer treasured up—what serious influence it often exercised both upon public and private proceeding.¹ The hexameter verses in which the Pythian priestess delivered herself were indeed often so equivocal or unintelligible, that the most serious believer, with all anxiety to interpret and obey them, often found himself ruined by the result. Yet the general faith in the oracle was noway shaken by such painful experience. For as the unfortunate issue always admitted of being explained upon two hypotheses—either that the god had spoken falsely, or that his meaning had not been correctly understood—no man of genuine piety ever hesitated to adopt the latter. There were many other oracles throughout Greece besides Delphi and Dodona: Apollo was open to the inquiries of the faithful at Ptôon in Bœotia, at Abæ in Phokis, at Branchidæ near Miletus, at Patara in Lykia, and other places: in like manner Zeus gave answers at Olympia, Poseidôn at Tænarus, Ampliaraus at Thebes, Amphiloehus at Mallus, &c. And this habit of consulting the oracle formed part of the still more general tendency of the Greek mind to undertake no enterprise without having first ascertained how the gods viewed it, and what measures they were likely to take. Sacrifices were offered, and the interior of the victim carefully examined, with the same intent: omens, prodigies, unlooked-for coincidences, casual expressions, &c. were all con-

Oracles generally—habit of the Greek mind to consult them.

¹ See the argument in favour of divination placed by Cicero in the mouth of his brother Quintus, *De Divin.*, lib. i. Chrysippus and the ablest of the stoic philosophers set forth a plausible theory demonstrating *à priori* the probability of prophetic warnings deduced from the existence and attributes of the gods; if you deny altogether the occurrence of such warnings, so essential to the welfare of man, you must deny either the existence, or the foreknowledge, or the beneficence, of the gods (c. 38). Then the veracity of the Delphian oracle had been demonstrated in innumerable instances, of which Chrysippus had made a large collection: and upon what other supposition could the immense credit of

the oracle be explained (c. 19)? “Collegit innumerabilia oracula Chrysippus, et nullum sine locuplete teste et auctore: quæ quia nota tibi sunt, relinquo. Defendo unum hoc: nunquam illud oraculum Delphis tam celebre clarumque fuisset, neque tantis donis refertum omnium populorum et regum, nisi omnis ætas oraculorum illorum veritatem esset experta . . . Maneat id, quod negari non potest, nisi omnem historiam perverterimus, multis sæculis verax fuisse id oraculum.” Cicero admits that it had become less trustworthy in his time, and tries to explain this decline of prophetic power: compare Plutarch, *De Defect. Oracul.*

strued as significant of the divine will. To sacrifice with a view to this or that undertaking, or to consult the oracle with the same view, are familiar expressions¹ embodied in the language. Nor could any man set about a scheme with comfort until he had satisfied himself in some manner or other that the gods were favourable to it.

The disposition here adverted to is one of those mental analogies pervading the whole Hellenic nation, which Herodotus indicates. And the common habit among all Greeks of respectfully listening to the oracle of Delphi will be found on many occasions useful in maintaining unanimity among men not accustomed to obey the same political superior. In the numerous colonies especially, founded by mixed multitudes from distant parts of Greece, the minds of the emigrants were greatly determined towards cordial co-operation by their knowledge that the expedition had been directed, the *Ækist* indicated, and the spot either chosen or approved, by Apollo of Delphi. Such in most cases was the fact: that god, according to the conception of the Greeks, "takes delight always in the foundation of new cities, and himself in person lays the first stone."²

These are the elements of union—over and above the common territory, described in the last chapter—with which the historical Hellens take their start: community of blood, language, religious point of view, legends, sacrifices, festivals,³ and also (with certain allowances) of manners and character. The analogy of manners and character between the rude inhabitants of the Arcadian Kynætha⁴ and the polite Athens, was indeed accompanied with wide differences: yet if we compare the two with foreign contemporaries, we shall find certain negative characteristics, of much importance, common to both. In no city of historical Greece did there prevail either human sacrifices⁵—or deliberate mutilation, such as cutting off the nose, ears, hands, feet, &c.—or castration—or selling of children into slavery—or polygamy—or the feeling of unlimited obedience towards one man: all customs which might be pointed out as existing among the contemporary Carthaginians, Egyptians, Persians, Thra-

¹ Xenophon, *Anab.* vii. 8, 20:—'Ο δὲ Ἀσιδάτης ἀκούσας, ὅτι πάλιν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τεθυμένος εἶη Ξενοφῶν, ἐξαυλίζεται, &c. Xenophon. *Hellen.* iii. 2, 22:—μὴ χρησ-τηριάζεσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐφ' Ἑλλήνων πολέμῳ—compare *Iliad*, vii. 450.

² Callimach. *Hymn.* *Apoll.* 55, with Spanheim's note; Cicero, *De Divinat.*

i. 1.

³ See this point strikingly illustrated by Plato, *Repub.* v. p. 470–471 (c. 16), and Isocrates, *Panegy.* p. 102.

⁴ Respecting the Arcadian Kynætha, see the remarkable observations of Polybius, iv. 17–23.

⁵ See vol. i. ch. vi. of this History.

cians,¹ &c. The habit of running, wrestling, boxing, &c. in gymnastic contests, with the body perfectly naked—was common to all Greeks, having been first adopted as a Lacedæmonian fashion in the fourteenth Olympiad: Thucydidēs and Herodotus remark, that it was not only not practised, but even regarded as unseemly, among Non-Hellens.² Of such customs, indeed, at once common to all the Greeks, and peculiar to them as distinguished from others, we cannot specify a great number; but we may see enough to convince ourselves that there did really exist, in spite of local differences, a general Hellenic sentiment and character, which counted among the cementing causes of a union apparently so little assured.

For we must recollect, that in respect to political sovereignty, complete disunion was among their most cherished principles. The only source of supreme authority to which a Greek felt respect and attachment, was to be sought within the walls of his own city. Authority seated in another city might operate upon his fears—might procure for him increased security and advantages, as we shall have occasion hereafter to show with regard to Athens and her subject allies—might even be mildly exercised, and inspire no special aversion: but still the principle of it was repugnant to the rooted sentiment of his mind, and he is always found gravitating towards the distinct sovereignty of his own Boulê or Ekklēsia. This is a disposition common both to democracies and oligarchies, and operative even among the different towns belonging to the same subdivision of the Hellenic name—Achæans, Phokians, Bœotians, &c. The twelve Achæan cities are harmonious allies,

Political sovereignty attached to each separate city—essential to the Hellenic mind.

¹ For examples and evidences of these practices, see Herodot. ii. 162; the amputation of the nose and ears of Patarbémis by Apries king of Egypt (Xenophon, Anab. i. 9–13). There were a large number of men deprived of hands, feet, or eyesight, in the satrapy of Cyrus the younger, who had inflicted all these severe punishments for the prevention of crime—he did not (says Xenophon) suffer criminals to scoff at him (εἶα καταγελᾶν). The ἐκτομή was carried on at Sardis (Herodot. iii. 49)—500 παῖδες ἐκτόμιοι formed a portion of the yearly tribute paid by the Babylonians to the court of Susa (Herod. iii. 92). Selling of children for exportation by the Thracians (Herod. v. 6); there is some trace of this at Athens prior to the Solonian

legislation (Plutarch, Solôn, 23), arising probably out of the cruel state of the law between debtor and creditor. For the sacrifice of children to Kronos by the Carthaginians, in troubled times (according to the language of Ennius “Pœni soliti suos sacrificare puellios”), Diodor. xx. 14; xiii. 86. Porphyr. de Abstinēt. ii. 56: the practice is abundantly illustrated in Möver’s Die Religion der Phönizier, p. 298–304.

Arrian blames Alexander for cutting off the nose and ears of the satrap Bêsus, saying that it was an act altogether barbaric (i. e. non-Hellenic), (Exp. Al. iv. 7, 6). About the σεβασμὸς θεοπετιῆς περὶ τὸν βασιλείαν in Asia, see Strabo, xi. p. 526.

² Thucyd. i. 6; Herodot. i. 10.

with a periodical festival which partakes of the character of a congress,—but equal and independent political communities. The Bœotian towns, under the presidency of Thebes, their reputed metropolis, recognise certain common obligations, and obey, on various particular matters, chosen officers named Bœotarchs,—but we shall see, in this as in other cases, the centrifugal tendencies constantly manifesting themselves, and resisted chiefly by the interests and power of Thebes. That great, successful, and fortunate revolution which merged the several independent political communities of Attica into the single unity of Athens, took place before the time of authentic history: it is connected with the name of the hero Theseus, but we know not how it was effected, while its comparatively large size and extent render it a signal exception to Hellenic tendencies generally.

Political disunion—sovereign authority within the city-walls—thus formed a settled maxim in the Greek mind. The relation between one city and another was an international relation, not a relation subsisting between members of a common political aggregate. Within a few miles from his own city-walls, an Athenian found himself in the territory of another city, wherein he was nothing more than an alien,—where he could not acquire property in house or land, nor contract a legal marriage with any native woman, nor sue for legal protection against injury except through the mediation of some friendly citizen. The right of intermarriage and of acquiring landed property was occasionally granted by a city to some individual non-freeman, as matter of special favour, and sometimes (though very rarely) reciprocated generally between two separate cities.¹ But the obligations between one city and another, or between the citizen of the one and the citizen of the other, are all matters of special covenant, agreed to by the sovereign authority in each. Such coexistence of entire political severance with so much fellowship in other ways, is perplexing in modern ideas; and modern language is not well furnished with expressions to describe Greek political phænomena. We may say that an Athenian citizen was an *alien* when he arrived as a visitor in Corinth, but we can hardly say that he was a *foreigner*; and though the relations between Corinth and Athens were in principle *international*, yet that word would be obviously unsuitable to the numerous petty

¹ Aristot. Polit. iii. 6, 12. It is unnecessary to refer to the many inscriptions which confer upon some individual

non-freeman the right of ἐπιγαμία and ἑγκύκλις.

autonomies of Hellas, besides that we require it for describing the relations of Hellenes generally with Persians or Carthaginians. We are compelled to use a word such as *interpolitical*, to describe the transactions between separate Greek cities, so numerous in the course of this history.

As, on the one hand, a Greek will not consent to look for sovereign authority beyond the limits of his own city, so, on the other hand, he must have a city to look to: scattered villages will not satisfy in his mind the exigences of social order, security, and dignity. Though the coalescence of smaller towns into a larger is repugnant to his feelings, that of villages into a town appears to him a manifest advance in the scale of civilization. Such at least is the governing sentiment of Greece throughout the historical period; for there was always a certain portion of the Hellenic aggregate—the rudest and least advanced among them—who dwelt in unfortified villages, and upon whom the citizen of Athens, Corinth, or Thebes looked down as inferiors. Such village residence was the character of the Epirots¹ universally, and prevailed throughout Hellas itself in those very early and even ante-Homeric times upon which Thucydides looked back as deplorably barbarous;—times of universal poverty and insecurity,—absence of pacific intercourse,—petty warfare and plunder, compelling every man to pass his life armed,—endless migration without any local attachments. Many of the considerable cities of Greece are mentioned as aggregations of pre-existing villages, some of them in times comparatively recent. Tegea and Mantinea in Arcadia represent in this way the confluence of eight villages and five villages respectively; Dymê in Achaia was brought together out of eight villages, and Elis in the same manner, at a period even later than the Persian invasion;² the like seems to have happened with Megara and Tanagra. A large proportion of the Arcadians continued their village life down to the time of the battle of Leuktra, and it suited the purposes of Sparta to keep them thus disunited; a policy which we shall see hereafter illustrated by the dismemberment of Mantinea (into its primitive component villages) which the Spartan contemporaries of Agesilaus carried into effect, but which was reversed as soon as the power of Sparta was no longer paramount,—as well as by the foundation of

¹ Skylax, Periplus. c. 28-33; Thucyd. ii. 80. See Dio Chrysostom, Or. xlvii. p. 225, vol. ii. ed. Reisk.—μᾶλλον ἡροῦντο διοικεῖσθαι κατὰ κώμας, τοῖς βαρβάροις

δμοίους, ἢ σχῆμα πόλεως καὶ ὄνομα ἔχειν.
² Strabo, viii. p. 337, 342, 386; Pausan. viii. 45, 1; Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 17-37.

but city government is essential—village residence is looked upon as an inferior scale of living.

Megalopolis out of a large number of petty Arcadian towns and villages, one of the capital measures of Epameinondas.¹ As this measure was an elevation of Arcadian importance, so the reverse proceeding—the breaking up of a city into its elementary villages—was not only a sentence of privation and suffering, but also a complete extinction of Grecian rank and dignity.

The Ozolian Lokrians, the Ætolians, and the Akarnanians maintained their separate village residence down to a still later period, preserving along with it their primitive rudeness and disorderly pugnacity.² Their villages were unfortified, and defended only by comparative inaccessibility; in case of need they fled for safety with their cattle into the woods and mountains. Amidst such inauspicious circumstances, there was no room for that expansion of the social and political feelings to which protected intra-mural residence and increased numbers gave birth; there was no consecrated acropolis or agora—no ornamented temples and porticos, exhibiting the continued offerings of successive generations³—no theatre for music or recitation, no gymnasium for athletic exercises—none of those fixed arrangements, for transacting public business with regularity and decorum, which the Greek citizen, with his powerful sentiment of locality, deemed essential to a dignified existence. The village was nothing more than a fraction and a subordinate, appertaining as a limb to the organised body called the City. But the City and

Village residents—numerous in early Greece—many of them coalesced into cities.

¹ Pausan. viii. 27, 2-5; Diod. xv. 72: compare Arist. Polit. ii. 1, 5.

The description of the *διοίκις* of Mantinea is in Xenophon, Hellen. v. 2, 6-8: it is a flagrant example of his philo-Laconian bias. We see by the case of the Phokians after the Sacred War (Diodor. xvi. 60; Pausan. x. 3, 2) how heavy a punishment this *διοίκις* was. Compare also the instructive speech of the Akanthian envoy Kleigenês at Sparta, when he invoked the Lacedæmonian interference for the purpose of crushing the incipient federation, or junction of towns into a common political aggregate, which was growing up round Olynthus (Xen. Hellen. v. 2, 11, 2). The wise and admirable conduct of Olynthus, and the reluctance of the lesser neighbouring cities to merge themselves in this union, are forcibly set forth; also the interest of Sparta in keeping all the Greek towns disunited. Compare the description of the treatment of Capua by the Romans (Livy, xxvi. 16).

² Thucyd. i. 5; iii. 94. Xenoph. Hellen. iv. 6, 5.

³ Pausanias, x. 4, 1; his remarks on the Phokian πόλις Panopeus indicate what he included in the idea of a πόλις: —εἶγε δομᾶσαι τις πόλιν καὶ τούτους, οἷς γε οὐκ ἀρχεῖα, οὐ γυμνάσιόν ἐστιν· οὐ θέατρον, οὐκ ἀγορὰν ἔχουσιν, οὐχ ὕδωρ κατερχόμενον ἐς κρήνην· ἀλλὰ ἐν στέγαις κοίλαις κατὰ τὰς καλῶν μάλιστα τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, ἐνταῦθα οἰκοῦσιν ἐπὶ χαράδρᾳ. ὅμως δὲ ὅροι γε τῆς χώρας εἰσιν αὐτοῖς εἰς τοὺς ὁμούς, καὶ ἐς τὸν σύλλογον συνέδρους καὶ οὗτοι πέμπουσι τὸν Φωκικόν.

The μικρὰ πολίσματα of the Pelasgians on the peninsula of Mount Athôs (Thucyd. iv. 109) seem to have been something between villages and cities. When the Phokians, after the Sacred War, were deprived of their cities and forced into villages by the Amphiktyons, the order was that no village should contain more than fifty houses, and that no village should be within the distance of a furlong of any other (Diodor. xvi. 60).

the State are in his mind and in his language one and the same. While no organisation less than the City can satisfy the exigences¹ of an intelligent freeman, the City is itself a perfect and self-sufficient whole, admitting no incorporation into any higher political unity. It deserves notice that Sparta even in the days of her greatest power was not (properly speaking) a city, but a mere agglutination of five adjacent villages, retaining unchanged its old-fashioned trim: for the extreme defensibility of its frontier and the military prowess of its inhabitants supplied the absence of walls, while the discipline imposed upon the Spartan exceeded in rigour and minuteness anything known in Greece. And thus Sparta, though less than a city in respect to external appearance, was more than a city in respect to perfection of drilling and fixity of political routine. The contrast between the humble appearance and the mighty reality is pointed out by Thucydides.² The inhabitants of the small territory of Pisa, wherein Olympia is situated, had once enjoyed the honourable privilege of administering the Olympic festival. Having been robbed of it and subjected by the more powerful Eleians, they took advantage of various movements and tendencies among the larger Grecian powers to try and regain it; and on one of these occasions we find their claim repudiated because they were villagers, and unworthy of so great a distinction.³ There was nothing to be called a city in the Pisatid territory.

Sparta—
retained its
old village
trim even at
the height of
its power.

In going through historical Greece, we are compelled to accept the Hellenic aggregate with its constituent elements as a primary fact to start from, because the state of our information does not enable us to ascend any higher. By what circumstances, or out of what pre-existing elements, this aggregate was brought together and modified, we find no evidence entitled to credit. There are indeed various names which are affirmed to designate ante-Hellenic inhabitants of many parts of Greece,—the Pelasgi, the Leleges, the Kurètes, the Kaukônes, the Aones, the Temmikes, the Hyantes, the Telchines, the Bœotian Thracians, the Teleboæ, the Ephyri, the Phlegyæ, &c. These are names belonging to legendary, not to historical Greece—extracted out of a variety of conflicting legends, by the logogra-

Hellenic
aggregate
accepted as
a primary
fact—its
pre-existing
elements
untraceable.

¹ Aristot. Polit. i. 1, 8. ἡ δ' ἐκ πλειόνων καμῶν κοινωνία τέλειος πόλις, ἡ δὲ πάσης ἔχουσα πέρας τῆς αὐταρκείας. Com. pare also iii. 6, 14; and Plato, Legg. viii. p. 848.

² Thucyd. i. 10. οὔτε ξυνοικισθείσης

πόλεως, οὔτε ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτέλεσι χρησαμένης, κατὰ κάμῃας δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τρόπῳ οἰκισθείσης, φαίνονται ἂν ὑποδεεστέρα.

³ Xenophon, Hellen. iii. 2, 31.

phers and subsequent historians, who strung together out of them a supposed history of the past, at a time when the conditions of historical evidence were very little understood. That these names designated real nations, may be true, but here our knowledge ends. We have no well-informed witness to tell us their times, their limits of residence, their acts, or their character; nor do we know how far they are identical with or diverse from the historical Hellenes—whom we are warranted in calling, not indeed the first inhabitants of the country, but the first known to us upon any tolerable evidence. If any man is inclined to call the unknown ante-Hellenic period of Greece by the name of Pelasgic, it is open to him to do so. But this is a name carrying with it no assured predicates, noway enlarging our insight into real history, nor enabling us to explain—what would be the real historical problem—how or from whom the Hellenes acquired that stock of dispositions, aptitudes, arts, &c. with which they begin their career. Whoever has examined the many conflicting systems respecting the Pelasgi,—from the literal belief of Clavier, Larcher, and Raoul Rochette (which appears to me at least the most consistent way of proceeding), to the interpretative and half-incredulous processes applied by abler men, such as Niebuhr, or O. Müller, or Dr. Thirlwall¹—will not be displeased with my resolution to decline so insoluble a problem. No attested facts are now present to us—none were present to Herodotus and Thucydides even in their age—on which to build trustworthy affirmations respecting the ante-Hellenic Pelasgians. And where such is the case, we may without impropriety apply the remark of Herodotus respecting one of the theories which he had heard for explaining the inundation of the Nile by a sup-

¹ Larcher, *Chronologie d'Hérodote*, ch. viii. p. 215, 274; Raoul Rochette, *Histoire des Colonies Grecques*, book i. ch. 5; Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 26–64, 2nd ed. (the section entitled *Die Oenotrer und Pelasger*); O. Müller, *Die Etrusker*, vol. i. (Einleitung, ch. ii. p. 75–100); Dr. Thirlwall, *History of Greece*, vol. i. ch. ii. p. 36–64. The dissentient opinions of Kruse and Mannert may be found in Kruse, *Hellas*, vol. i. p. 398–425; Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, Part viii. introduction, p. 4. *seqq.*

Niebuhr puts together all the mythical and genealogical traces, many of them in the highest degree vague and equivocal, of the existence of Pelasgi in various localities; and then, summing

up their cumulative effect, asserts (“not as an hypothesis, but with full historical conviction,” p. 54) “that there was a time when the Pelasgians, perhaps the most extended people in all Europe, were spread from the Po and the Arno to the Rhyndakus” (near Kyzikus), with only an interruption in Thrace. What is perhaps the most remarkable of all, is the contrast between his feeling of disgust, despair and aversion to the subject, when he begins the inquiry (“the name Pelasgi,” he says, “is odious to the historian, who hates the spurious philology out of which the pretences to knowledge on the subject of such extinct people arise,” p. 28), and the full confidence and satisfaction with which he concludes it.

posed connexion with the circumfluous Ocean—that “the man who carries up his story into the invisible world, passes out of the range of criticism.”¹

As far as our knowledge extends, there were no towns or villages called Pelasgian, in Greece Proper, since 776 B.C. But there still existed in two different places, even in the age of Herodotus, people whom he believed to be Pelasgians. One portion of these occupied the towns of Plakia and Skylakê near Kyzikus, on the Propontis; another dwelt in a town called Krêstôn, near the Thermaic Gulf.² There were moreover certain other Pelasgian townships which he does not specify—it seems indeed, from Thucydidês, that there were some little Pelasgian townships on the peninsula of Athos.³ Now Herodotus acquaints us with the remarkable fact, that the people of Krêstôn, those of Plakia and Skylakê, and those of the other unnamed Pelasgian townships, all spoke the same language, and each of them respectively a different language from their neighbours around them. He informs us, moreover, that their language was a barbarous (*i. e.* a non-Hellenic) language; and this fact he quotes as an evidence to prove that the ancient Pelasgian language was a barbarous language, or distinct from the Hellenic. He at the same time states expressly that he has no positive knowledge what language the ancient Pelasgians spoke—one proof, among others, that no memorials nor means of distinct information concerning that people could have been open to him.

This is the one single fact, amidst so many conjectures concerning the Pelasgians, which we can be said to know upon the testimony of a competent and contemporary witness: the few townships—scattered and inconsiderable, but all that Herodotus in his day knew as Pelasgian—spoke a barbarous language. And upon such a point he must be regarded as an excellent judge. If then (infers the historian) all the early Pelasgians spoke the same language as those of Krêstôn and Plakia, they must have changed their language at the time when they passed into the Hellenic aggregate, or became Hellens. Now Herodotus conceives that aggregate to have been gradually enlarged to its great actual size by incorporating with itself not

¹ Herodot. ii. 23 :—“Ὁ δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ὠκεάνου εἶπας, ἐς ἀφανὲς τὸν μῦθον ἀνενείκας, οὐκ ἔχει ἐλεγχόν.”

² That Krêstôn is the proper reading in Herodotus there seems every reason to believe—not Krotôn, as Dionys. Hal. represents it (Ant. Rom. i. 26)—in spite of the authority of Niebuhr in favour of the latter.

³ Thucyd. iv. 109. Compare the new Fragmenta of Strabo, lib. vii. edited from the Vatican MS. by Kramer, and since by Tafel (Tübingen, 1844), sect. 34. p. 26,—“ἤκησαν δὲ τὴν Χερρόνησον ταύτην τῶν ἐκ Λήμνου Πελασγῶν τινες, εἰς πέντε διηρήμενοι πόλιστα· Κλεωνᾶς, Ὀλόφυξον, Ἀκροθώους, Δῖον, Θύσσον.”

Ancient Pelasgians not knowable.

Historical Pelasgians —spoke a barbarous language.

only the Pelasgians, but several other nations once barbarians;¹ the Hellens having been originally an inconsiderable people. Among those other nations once barbarian whom Herodotus supposes to have become hellenised, we may probably number the Leleges; and with respect to them as well as to the Pelasgians, we have contemporary testimony proving the existence of barbarian Leleges in later times. Philippus the Karian historian attested the present existence, and believed in the past existence, of Leleges in his country as serfs or dependent cultivators under the Karians, analogous to the Helots in Laconia or the Penestæ in Thessaly.² We may be very sure that there were no Hellens—no men speaking the Hellenic tongue—standing in such a relation to the Karians. Among those many barbaric-speaking nations whom Herodotus believed to have changed their language and passed into Hellens, we may therefore fairly consider the Leleges to have been included. For next to the Pelasgians and Pelasgus, the Leleges and Lelex figure most conspicuously in the legendary genealogies; and both together cover the larger portion of the Hellenic soil.

Historical
Leleges—
barbarians
in language
also.

Statements
of good wit-
nesses re-
garding the
historical
Pelasgians
and Leleges
are to be
admitted,—
whether they
fit the
legendary
Pelasgians
and Leleges
or not.

Confining myself to historical evidence, and believing that no assured results can be derived from the attempt to transform legend into history, I accept the statement of Herodotus with confidence as to the barbaric language spoken by the Pelasgians of his day, and I believe the same with regard to the historical Leleges—but without presuming to determine anything in regard to the legendary Pelasgians and Leleges, the supposed ante-Hellenic inhabitants of Greece. And I think this course more consonant to the laws of historical inquiry than that which comes recommended by the high authority of Dr. Thirlwall, who softens and explains away the statement of Herodotus until it is made to mean only that the Pelasgians of Plakia and Krêstôn spoke a very bad Greek. The affirmation of Herodotus is distinct, and twice repeated, that the Pelasgians of these towns and of his own time spoke a barbaric language; and that word appears to me to admit of but one interpretation.³ To

¹ Herod. i. 57. προσκεχωρηκότων αὐτῶ καὶ ἄλλων ἐθνέων βαρβάρων συγχῶν.

² Athenæ. vi. p. 271. Φίλιππος ἐν τῷ περὶ Καρῶν καὶ Λελέγων συγγράμματι, καταλέξας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων Εἰλωτας καὶ τοὺς Θετταλικοὺς πενέστας, καὶ Κᾱράς φησι τοῖς Λέλεξιν ὡς οἰκέταις χρήσασθαι πάλαι τε καὶ νῦν.

³ Herod. i. 57. Ἦντινα δὲ γλῶσσαν ἔσαν οἱ Πελασγοί, οὐκ ἔχω ἀπρεκέως εἶπαι. εἰ δὲ χρεὼν ἐστὶ τεκμαιρομένοις λέγειν τοῖσι νῦν ἔτι ἐοῦσι Πελασγῶν, τῶν ὑπὲρ Τυρσηνῶν Κρηστῶνα πόλιν οἰκόντων . . . καὶ τὴν Πλακίην τε καὶ Σκυλάκην Πελασγῶν οἰκισάντων ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ . . . καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα Πελασγικὰ ἔδοντα πολίσ-

suppose that a man who, like Herodotus, had heard almost every variety of Greek, in the course of his long travels, as well as Egyp-

ματα τὸ ὄνομα μετέβαλε· εἰ τοιούτοις δεῖ λέγειν, ἥσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλώσσαν ἴεντες. Εἰ τοίνυν ἦν καὶ πᾶν τοιοῦτο τὸ Πελασγικόν, τὸ Ἀττικὸν ἔθνος, ἔδν Πελασγικὸν ἅμα τῇ μεταβολῇ τῇ ἐς Ἑλληνας καὶ τὴν γλώσσαν μετέβαλε· καὶ γὰρ δὴ οὔτε οἱ Κρησιῶνιται οὐδ᾽ αἰοῖσι τῶν νῦν σφέας περιρικόντων εἰσι δμῶγλωσσοι, οὔτε οἱ Πλακιῶνι· σφίσι δὲ, δμῶγλωσσοι. δηλοῦσι δὲ, ὅτι τὸν ἠέλκαντο γλώσσης χαρακτῆρα μεταβαίνοντες ἐς ταῦτα τὰ χῶρια, τοῦτον ἔχουσι ἐν φυλακῇ.

In the next chapter Herodotus again calls the Pelasgian nation *βάρβαρον*.

Respecting this language heard by Herodotus at Kréston and Plakia, Dr. Thirlwall observes (chap. ii. p. 60), "This language Herodotus describes as barbarous, and it is on this fact he grounds his general conclusion as to the ancient Pelasgian tongue. But he has not entered into any details that might have served to ascertain the manner or degree in which it differed from the Greek. Still the expressions he uses would have appeared to imply that it was essentially foreign, had he not spoken quite as strongly in another passage, where it is impossible to ascribe a similar meaning to his words. When he is enumerating the dialects that prevailed among the Ionian Greeks, he observes that the Ionian cities in Lydia agree not at all in their tongue with those of Karia; and he applies the very same term to these dialects, which he had before used in speaking of the remains of the Pelasgian language. This passage affords a measure by which we may estimate the force of the word *barbarian* in the former. Nothing more can be safely inferred from it, than that the Pelasgian language which Herodotus heard on the Hellespont, and elsewhere, sounded to him a strange jargon; as did the dialect of Ephesus to a Milesian, and as the Bolognese does to a Florentine. This fact leaves its real nature and relation to the Greek quite uncertain; and we are the less justified in building on it, as the history of Pelasgian settlements is extremely obscure, and the traditions which Herodotus reports on that subject have by no means equal weight with statements made from his personal observation." (Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece, ch. ii. p. 60, 2nd edit.)

In the statement delivered by Herodotus (to which Dr. Thirlwall here re-

fers) about the language spoken in the Ionic Greek cities, the historian had said (i. 142),—Γλώσσαν δὲ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν οἱ τοῖνοι κασι, ἀλλὰ τῶν τεσσέρας παραγωγέων. Miletus, Myus, and Priène, —ἐν τῇ Καρίῃ κατοικηται κατὰ ταῦτα διαλεγόμενα σφι. Ephesus, Kolophon, &c.—αὐταὶ αἱ πόλεις τῇσι πρότερον λεχθεισῇσι ὁμολογέουσι κατὰ γλώσσαν οὐδὲν, σφὶ δὲ ὁμοφονέουσι. The Chians and Erythraeans —κατὰ τῶντ᾽ διαλέγονται, Σάμιοι δὲ ἐπ' ἐωπτῶν μούνοι. Οἱ τοῖνοι χαρακτῆρας γλώσσης τέσσερες γίνονται.

The words γλώσσης χαρακτῆρ ("distinctive mode of speech") are common to both these passages, but their meaning in the one and in the other is to be measured by reference to the subject-matter of which the author is speaking, as well as to the words which accompany them,—especially the word *βάρβαρος* in the first passage. Nor can I think (with Dr. Thirlwall) that the meaning of *βάρβαρος* is to be determined by reference to the other two words: the reverse is in my judgement correct. *βάρβαρος* is a term definite and unequivocal, but γλώσσης χαρακτῆρ varies according to the comparison which you happen at the moment to be making, and its meaning is here determined by its conjunction with *βάρβαρος*.

When Herodotus was speaking of the twelve Ionic cities in Asia, he might properly point out the differences of speech among them as so many different *χαρακτῆρας γλώσσης*: the limits of difference were fixed by the knowledge which his hearers possessed of the persons about whom he was speaking; the Ionians being all notoriously Hellenes. So an author describing Italy might say that Bolognese, Romans, Neapolitans, Genoese, &c., had different *χαρακτῆρας γλώσσης*, it being understood that the difference was such as might subsist among persons all Italians.

But there is also a *χαρακτῆρ γλώσσης* of Greek generally (abstraction made of its various dialects and diversities) as contrasted with Persian, Phœnician, or Latin—and of Italian generally, as contrasted with German or English. It is this comparison which Herodotus is taking when he describes the language spoken by the people of Kréston and Plakia, and which he notes by the word *βάρβαρον* as opposed to Ἑλληνικόν: it is with reference to this comparison that

tian, Phœnician, Assyrian, Lydian, and other languages, did not know how to distinguish bad Hellenic from non-Hellenic, is in my judgement inadmissible; at any rate the supposition is not to be adopted without more cogent evidence than any which is here found.

As I do not presume to determine what were the antecedent internal elements out of which the Hellenic aggregate was formed, so I confess myself equally uninformed with regard to its external constituents. Kadmus, Danaus, Kekrops—the eponyms of the Kadmeians, of the Danaans, and of the Attic Kekropia—present themselves to my vision as creatures of legend, and in that character I have already adverted to them. That there may have been very early settlements in continental Greece from Phœnicia and Egypt, is nowise impossible; but I see neither positive proof, nor ground for probable inference, that there were any such, though traces of Phœnician settlements in some of the islands may doubtless be pointed out. And if we examine the character and aptitude of Greeks, as compared either with Egyptians or Phœnicians, it will appear that there is not only no analogy, but an obvious and fundamental contrast: the Greek may occasionally be found as a borrower from these ultramarine contemporaries, but he cannot be looked upon as their offspring or derivative. Nor can I bring myself to accept an hypothesis which implies (unless we are to regard the supposed foreign immigrants as very few in number, in which case the question loses most of its importance) that the Hellenic language—the noblest among the many varieties of human speech, and possessing within itself a pervading symmetry and organization—is a mere confluence of two foreign barbaric languages (Phœnician and Egyptian) with two or more internal barbaric languages—Pelasgian, Lelegian, &c. In the mode of investigation pursued by different historians into this question of early foreign colonies, there is great difference (as in the case of the Pelasgi) between different authors—from the acquiescent Euemerism

χαρακτήρ γλώσσης in the fifty-seventh chapter is to be construed. The word *βάρβαρος* is the usual and recognised antithesis of *Ἕλλην* or *Ἑλληνικός*.

It is not the least remarkable part of the statement of Herodotus, that the language spoken at *Krêstôn* and at *Plakia* was the same, though the places were so far apart from each other. This identity of itself shows that he meant to

speak of a substantive language, not of a "strange jargon."

I think it therefore certain that Herodotus pronounces the Pelasgians of his day to speak a substantive language different from Greek; but whether differing from it in a greater or less degree (*e.g.* in the degree of Latin or of Phœnician) we have no means of deciding.

of Raoul Rochette to the refined distillation of Dr. Thirlwall in the third chapter of his History. It will be found that the amount of positive knowledge which Dr. Thirlwall guarantees to his readers in that chapter is extremely inconsiderable; for though he proceeds upon the general theory (different from that which I hold) that historical matter may be distinguished and elicited from the legends, yet when the question arises respecting any definite historical result, his canon of credibility is too just to permit him to overlook the absence of positive evidence, even when all intrinsic incredibility is removed. That which I note as Terra Incognita, is in his view a land which may be known up to a certain point; but the map which he draws of it contains so few ascertained places as to differ very little from absolute vacuity.

The most ancient district called Hellas is affirmed by Aristotle to have been near Dôdôna and the river Achelôus—a de-
Most ancient
Hellas—
Græci.
 scription which would have been unintelligible (since the river does not flow near Dôdôna), if it had not been qualified by the remark, that the river had often in former times changed its course. He states moreover that the deluge of Deukaliôn took place chiefly in this district, which was in those early days inhabited by the Selli, and by the people then called Græci, but now Hellenes.¹ The Selli (called by Pindar Helli) are mentioned in the Iliad as the ministers of the Dodonæan Zeus—"men who slept on the ground and never washed their feet," and Hesiod in one of the lost poems (the Eoiai) speaks of the fat land and rich pastures of the land called Hellopia wherein Dôdôna was situated.² On what authority Aristotle made his statement, we do not know; but the general feeling of the Greeks was different, connecting Deukaliôn, Hellen, and the Hellenes, primarily and specially with the territory called Achaia Phthiôtis, between Mount Othrys and Cæta. We can neither affirm nor deny his assertion that the people in the neighbourhood of Dôdôna were called Græci before they were called Hellenes. There is no ascertained instance of the mention of a people called Græci in any author earlier than this Aristotelian treatise; for the allusions to Alkman and Sophoklês prove nothing to the point.³ Nor can we explain how it came to pass

¹ Aristotel. Meteorol. i. 14.

² Homer, Iliad, xvi. 234; Hesiod, Fragm. 149, ed. Marktscheffel; Sophokl. Trachin. 1174; Strabo, vii. p. 328.

³ Stephan. Byz. v. Γραικός.—Γραικες δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἀλκμάνι αἱ τῶν Ἑλλήνων

μητέρες, καὶ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Πόλυσιν. ἐστὶ δὲ ἡ μεταπλασμός, ἡ τῆς Γραιξ εὐθελος κλίσις ἐστίν.

The word Γραικες in Alkman, meaning "the mothers of the Hellenes," may well be only a dialectic variety of γραιες, analogous to κλαῖξ and ὕρσις, for

that the Hellenes were known to the Romans only under the name of Græci or Graii. But the name by which a people is known to foreigners is often completely different from its own domestic name, and we are not less at a loss to assign the reason, how the Rasena of Etruria came to be known to the Romans by the name of Tuscans or Etruscans.

κλεις, ὄρνις, &c. (Ahrens, De Dialecto Doricâ, sect. 11, p. 91; and sect. 31, p. 242), perhaps declined like γυναῖκες.

The term used by Sophoklês, if we may believe Photius, was not Γραικός,

but Γραικός (Photius, p. 480, 15; Dindorf, Fragment. Soph. 933; compare 455). Eustathius (p. 890) seems undecided between the two.

CHAPTER III.

MEMBERS OF THE HELLENIC AGGREGATE, SEPARATELY TAKEN.—GREEKS NORTH OF PELOPONNESUS.

HAVING in the preceding chapter touched upon the Greeks in their aggregate capacity, I now come to describe separately the portions of which this aggregate consisted, as they present themselves at the first discernible period of history.

It has already been mentioned that the twelve races or subdivisions, members of what is called the Amphiktyonic con-
vocation, were as follows:—

Amphikty-
onic races.

North of the pass of Thermopylæ,—Thessalians, Perrhæbians, Magnètes, Achæans, Melians, Ænians, Dolopes.

South of the pass of Thermopylæ,—Dorians, Ionians, Bœotians, Lokrians, Phokians.

Other Hellenic races, not comprised among the Amphiktyons, were—

Non-Am-
phiktyonic
races.

The Ætoliars and Akarnanians, north of the Gulf of Corinth.

The Arcadians, Eleians, Pisatans, and Triphylians, in the central and western portion of Peloponnêsus: I do not here name the Achæans, who occupied the southern or Peloponnesian coast of the Corinthian gulf, because they may be presumed to have been originally of the same race as the Phthiot Achæans, and therefore participant in the Amphiktyonic constituency, though their actual connexion with it may have been disused.

The Dryopes, an inconsiderable, but seemingly peculiar subdivision, who occupied some scattered points on the sea-coast—Hermionê on the Argolic peninsula; Styrys and Karystus in Eubœa; the island of Kythnus, &c.

Though it may be said, in a general way, that our historical discernment of the Hellenic aggregate, apart from the illusions of legend, commences with 776 B.C., yet with regard to the larger number of its subdivisions just enumerated, we can hardly be said to possess any specific facts anterior to the invasion of Xerxes in 480 B.C. Until the year 560 B.C. (the epoch of Cræsus in Asia Minor, and of Peisistratus at Athens), the history

First period
of Grecian
history—
from 776—
560 B.C.

of the Greeks presents hardly anything of a collective character : the movements of each portion of the Hellenic world begin and end apart from the rest. The destruction of Kirrha by the Amphiktyons is the first historical incident which brings into play, in defence of the Delphian temple, a common Hellenic feeling of active obligation.

But about 560 B.C., two important changes are seen to come into operation which alter the character of Grecian history—
Second period—from 560–300 B.C. extricating it out of its former chaos of detail, and centralising its isolated phenomena:—1. The subjugation of the Asiatic Greeks by Lydia and by Persia, followed by their struggles for emancipation—wherein the European Greeks became implicated, first as accessories, and afterwards as principals. 2. The combined action of the large mass of Greeks under Sparta, as their most powerful state and acknowledged chief, succeeded by the rapid and extraordinary growth of Athens, the complete development of Grecian maritime power, and the struggle between Athens and Sparta for the headship. These two causes, though distinct in themselves, must nevertheless be regarded as working together to a certain degree—or rather the second grew out of the first. For it was the Persian invasions of Greece which first gave birth to a wide-spread alarm and antipathy among the leading Greeks (we must not call it Pan-Hellenic, since more than half of the Amphiktyonic constituency gave earth and water to Xerxes) against the barbarians of the East, and impressed them with the necessity of joint active operations under a leader. The idea of a leadership or hegemony of collective Hellas, as a privilege necessarily vested in some one state for common security against the barbarians, thus became current—an idea foreign to the mind of Solôn, or any one of the same age. Next came the miraculous development of Athens, and the violent contest between her and Sparta which should be the leader; the larger portion of Hellas taking side with one or the other, and the common quarrel against the Persian being for the time put out of sight. Athens is put down, Sparta acquires the undisputed hegemony, and again the anti-barbaric feeling manifests itself, though faintly, in the Asiatic expeditions of Agesilaus. But the Spartans, too incompetent either to deserve or maintain this exalted position, are overthrown by the Thebans—themselves not less incompetent, with the single exception of Epameinondas. The death of that single man extinguishes the pretensions of Thebes to the hegemony. Hellas is left, like the deserted Penelopê in the *Odyssey*, worried by the competition of several

suitors, none of whom is strong enough to stretch the bow on which the prize depends.¹ Such a manifestation of force, as well as the trampling down of the competing suitors, is reserved, not for any legitimate Hellenic arm, but for a semi-hellenised² Macedonian, "brought up at Pella," and making good his encroachments gradually from the north of Olympus. The hegemony of Greece thus passes for ever out of Grecian hands; but the conqueror finds his interest in reviving, as a name and pretext, the old miso-Persian banner, after it had ceased to represent any real or earnest feeling, and had given place to other impulses of more recent growth. The desolation and sacrilege once committed by Xerxes at Athens is avenged by annihilation of the Persian empire. And this victorious consummation of the once powerful Pan-Hellenic antipathy—the dream of Xenophon³ and the Ten Thousand Greeks after the battle of Kunaxa—the hope of Jason of Pheræ—the exhortation of Isokratês⁴—the project of Philip and the achievement of Alexander,—while it manifests the irresistible might of Hellenic and Macedonian arms in the then existing state of the world, is at the same time the closing scene of substantive Grecian life. The citizen-feelings of Greece become afterwards merely secondary forces, subordinate to the preponderance of Greek mercenaries under Macedonian order, and to the rudest of all native Hellenes—the Ætolian mountaineers. Some few individuals are indeed found, even in the third century B.C., worthy of the best times of Hellas, and the Achæan confederation of that century is an honourable attempt to contend against irresistible difficulties: but on the whole, that free, social, and political march, which gives so much interest to the earlier centuries, is irrevocably banished from Greece after the generation of Alexander the Great.

The foregoing brief sketch will show that, taking the period from Cræsus and Peisistratus down to the generation of Alexander (560-300 B.C.), the phænomena of Hellas generally, and her relations both foreign and inter-political, admit of being grouped together in masses with continued dependence on one or a few predominant cir-

Important differences between the two—the first period preparatory and very little known.

¹ Xenophon, Hellen. vii. 5, 27; Demosthenes, De Coron. c. 7, p. 231.—*ἀλλὰ τις ἦν ἄκριτος καὶ παρὰ τοῖς καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλλησιν ἐρὶς καὶ ταραχή.*

² Demosthen. de Coron. c. 21. p. 247.

³ Xenophon, Anab. iii. 2, 25-26.

⁴ Xenophon, Hellen. vi. 1, 12; Isokratês, Orat. ad Philipp., Orat. v. p. 107. This discourse of Isokratês is

composed expressly for the purpose of calling on Philip to put himself at the head of united Greece against the Persians: the Oratio iv., called Panegyrica, recommends a combination of all Greeks for the same purpose, but under the hegemony of Athens, putting aside all intestine differences: see Orat. iv. p. 45-68.

cumstances. They may be said to constitute a sort of historical epopee, analogous to that which Herodotus has constructed out of the wars between Greeks and barbarians, from the legends of Iô and Eurôpa down to the repulse of Xerxes. But when we are called back to the period between 776 and 560 B.C., the phenomena brought to our knowledge are scanty in number—exhibiting few common feelings or interests, and no tendency towards any one assignable purpose. To impart attraction to this first period, so obscure and unpromising, we shall be compelled to consider it in its relation with the second; partly as a preparation, partly as a contrast.

Of the extra-Peloponnesian Greeks north of Attica, during these two centuries, we know absolutely nothing; but it will be possible to furnish some information respecting the early condition and struggles of the great Dorian states in Peloponnêsus, and respecting the rise of Sparta from the second to the first place in the comparative scale of Grecian powers. Athens becomes first known to us at the legislation of Drako and the attempt of Kylôn (620 B.C.) to make himself despot; and we gather some facts concerning the Ionic cities in Eubœa and Asia Minor during the century of their chief prosperity, prior to the reign and conquests of Crœsus. In this way we shall form to ourselves some idea of the growth of Sparta and Athens,—of the short-lived and energetic development of the Ionic Greeks—and of the slow working of those causes which tended to bring about increased Hellenic intercommunication—as contrasted with the enlarged range of ambition, the grand Pan-Hellenic ideas, the systematised party-antipathies, and the intensified action both abroad and at home, which grew out of the contest with Persia.

There are also two or three remarkable manifestations which will require special notice during this first period of Grecian history:—1. The great multiplicity of colonies sent forth by individual cities, and the rise and progress of these several colonies; 2. The number of despots who arose in the various Grecian cities; 3. The lyric poetry; 4. The rudiments of that which afterwards ripened into moral philosophy, as manifested in gnomes or aphorisms—or the age of the Seven Wise Men.

But before I proceed to relate those earliest proceedings (unfortunately too few) of the Dorians and Ionians during the historical period, together with the other matters just alluded to, it will be convenient to go over the names and positions of those other Grecian states respecting which we have no information during

Extra-Peloponnesian
Greeks
(north of
Attica) not
known at all
during the
first period.

these first two centuries. Some idea will thus be formed of the less important members of the Hellenic aggregate, previous to the time when they will be called into action. We begin by the territory north of the pass of Thermopylæ.

Of the different races who dwelt between this celebrated pass and the mouth of the river Peneius, by far the most powerful and important were the Thessalians. Sometimes indeed the whole of this area passes under the name of Thessaly—since nominally, though not always really, the power of the Thessalians extended over the whole. We know that the Trachinian Herakleia, founded by the Lacedæmonians in the early years of the Peloponnesian war close at the pass of Thermopylæ, was planted upon the territory of the Thessalians.¹ But there were also within these limits other races, inferior and dependant on the Thessalians, yet said to be of more ancient date, and certainly not less genuine subdivisions of the Hellenic name. The Perrhæbi² occupied the northern portion of the territory between the lower course of the river Peneius and Mount Olympus. The Magnêtes³ dwelt along the eastern coast, between Mount Ossa and Pelion on one side and the Ægean on the other, comprising the south-eastern cape and the eastern coast of the Gulf of Pagasæ as far as Iôlkos. The Achæans occupied the territory called Phthiôtis, extending from near Mount Pindus on the west to the Gulf of Pagasæ on the east⁴—along the mountain chain of Othrys with its lateral projections northerly into the Thessalian plain, and southerly even to its junction with Cæta. The three tribes of the Malians dwelt between Achæa Phthiôtis and Thermopylæ, including both Trachin and Herakleia. Westward of Achæa Phthiôtis, the lofty region of Pindus or Tymphrêstus, with its declivities both westward and eastward, was occupied by the Dolopes.

All these five tribes or subdivisions—Perrhæbians, Magnêtes, Achæans of Phthiôtis, Malians, and Dolopes, together with certain Epirotic and Macedonian tribes besides, beyond the boundaries of Pindus and Olympus—were in a state of

General
sketch of
them.—
Greeks north
of Thermo-
pylæ.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 93. *Οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ ἐν δυνάμει ὄντες τῶν ταύτης χωρίων, καὶ ὧν ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ ἐκτίζετο* (Herakleia), &c.

² Herodot. vii. 173; Strabo, ix. p. 440–441. Herodotus notices the pass over the chain of Olympus or the Cambunian mountains by which Xerxes and his army passed out of Macedonia into Perrhæbia: see the description of the pass and the neighbouring country in Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*,

ch. xxviii. vol. iii. p. 338–348; compare Livy, xlii. 53.

³ Skylax, *Periplus*, c. 66; Herodot. vii. 183–188.

⁴ Skylax, *Periplus*, c. 64; Strabo, ix. p. 433–434. Sophoklēs included the territory of Trachin in the limits of Phthiôtis (Strabo, *l. c.*). Herodotus considers Phthiôtis as terminating a little north of the river Spercheius (vii. 198).

irregular dependence upon the Thessalians, who occupied the central plain or basin drained by the Peneius. That river receives the streams from Olympus, from Pindus, and from Othrys—flowing through a region which was supposed by its inhabitants to have been once a lake, until Poseidôn cut open the defile of Tempê, through which the waters found an efflux. In travelling northward from Thermopylæ, the commencement of this fertile region—the amplest space of land continuously productive which Hellas presents—is strikingly marked by the steep rock and ancient fortress of Thaumaki;¹ from whence the traveller, passing over the mountains of Achæa Phthiôtis and Othrys, sees before him the plains and low declivities which reach northward across Thessaly to Olympus. A narrow strip of coast—in the interior of the Gulf of Pagasæ, between the Magnètes and the Achæans, and containing the towns of Amphanæum and Pagasæ²—belonged to this proper territory of Thessaly, but its great expansion was inland: within it were situated the cities of Pheræ, Pharsalus, Skotussa, Larissa, Krannôn, Atrax, Pharkadôn, Triikka, Metropolis, Pelinna, &c.

The abundance of corn and cattle from the neighbouring plains sustained in these cities a numerous population, and above all a proud and disorderly noblesse, whose manners bore much resemblance to those of the heroic times. They were violent in their behaviour, eager in armed feud, but unaccustomed to political discussion or compromise; faithless as to obligations, yet at the same

¹ See the description of Thaumaki in Livy. xxxii. 4. and in Dr. Holland's Travels, ch. xvii. vol. ii. p. 112—now Thomoko.

² Skylax, Peripl. c. 65. Hesychius (v. Παγασίτης 'Απόλλων) seems to reckon Pagasæ as Achæan.

About the towns in Thessaly and their various positions, see Mannert, Geograph. der Gr. und Römer, Part vii. book iii. ch. 8 and 9.

There was an ancient religious ceremony, celebrated by the Delphians every ninth year (Ennaëtêris): a procession was sent from Delphi to the pass of Tempê, consisting of well-born youths under an archi-theôr, who represented the proceeding ascribed by an old legend to Apollo; that god was believed to have gone thither to receive expiation after the slaughter of the serpent Pytho: at least this was one among several discrepant legends. The chief youth plucked and brought back a branch from the sacred laurel at Tempê, as a token that he had fulfilled

his mission: he returned by "the sacred road," and broke his fast at a place called Δειπνιάς near Larissa. A solemn festival, frequented by a large concourse of people from the surrounding regions, was celebrated on this occasion at Tempê, in honour of Apollo Tempeitês (Ἀμπελοῦνι Τεμπείτῃ in the Æolic dialect of Thessaly: see Inscript. in Boeckh, Corp. Ins. No. 1767). The procession was accompanied by a flute-player.

See Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. ch. xi. p. 292; De Musicâ, ch. xiv. p. 1136; Ælian, V. H. iii. 1; Stephan. Byz. v. Δειπνιάς.

It is important to notice these religious processions as establishing intercourse and sympathies between the distant members of Hellas: but the inferences which O. Müller (Dorians, B. ii. 1, p. 222) would build upon them, as to the original seat of the Dorians and the worship of Apollo, are not to be trusted.

time generous in their hospitalities, and much given to the enjoyments of the table.¹ Breeding the finest horses in Greece they were distinguished for their excellence as cavalry; but their infantry is little noticed, nor do the Thessalian cities seem to have possessed that congregation of free and tolerably equal citizens, each master of his own arms, out of whom the ranks of hoplites were constituted. The warlike nobles, such as the Aleuadæ at Larissa, or the Skopadæ at Krannon, despising everything but equestrian service for themselves, furnished, from their extensive herds on the plain, horses for the poorer soldiers. These Thessalian cities exhibit the extreme of turbulent oligarchy, occasionally trampled down by some one man of great vigour, but little tempered by that sense of political communion and reverence for established law, which was found among the better cities of Hellas. Both in Athens and Sparta, so different in many respects from each other, this feeling will be found, if not indeed constantly predominant, yet constantly present and operative. Both of them exhibit a contrast with Larissa or Pheræ not unlike that between Rome and Capua—the former with her endless civil disputes constitutionally conducted, admitting the joint action of parties against a common foe; the latter with her abundant soil enriching a luxurious oligarchy, and impelled according to the feuds of her great proprietors, the Magii, Blossii, and Jubellii.²

Thessalian
character.

The Thessalians are indeed in their character and capacity as much Epirotic or Macedonian as Hellenic, forming a sort of link between the two. For the Macedonians, though trained in after-times upon Grecian principles by the genius of Philip and Alexander, so as to constitute the celebrated heavy-armed phalanx, were originally (even in the Peloponnesian war) distinguished chiefly for the excellence of their cavalry, like the Thessalian;³ while the broad-brimmed hat or kausia, and the short spreading mantle or chlamys, were common to both.

We are told that the Thessalians were originally immigrants

¹ Plato, *Krito*, c. 15, p. 53. ἐκεῖ γὰρ δὴ πλείστη ἀταξία καὶ ἀκολασία (compare the beginning of the *Menon*)—a remark the more striking, since he had just before described the Boeotian Thebes as a well-regulated city, though both Dikæarchus and Polybius represent it in their times as so much the contrary.

See also Demosthen. *Olynth.* i. c. 9, p. 16, cont. Aristokrat. c. 29, p. 657; Schol. Eurip. *Phœniss.* 1466; *Thepomp.*

Fragment. 54–178, ed. Didot; Aristophanês, *Plut.* 521.

The march of political affairs in Thessaly is understood from Xenoph. *Hellen.* vi. 1; compare *Anab.* i. 1, 10, and *Thucyd.* iv. 78.

² See Cicero, *Orat.* in *Pison.* c. 11; *De Leg. Agrar.* cont. *Rullum*, c. 34–35.

³ Compare the Thessalian cavalry as described by Polybius, iv. 8, with the Macedonian as described by Thucydides, ii. 100.

from Thesprotia in Epirus, and conquerors of the plain of the Peneius, which (according to Herodotus) was then called Æolis, and which they found occupied by the Pelasgi.¹ It may be doubted whether the great Thessalian families—such as the Aleuadæ of Larissa, descendants from Hêraklês, and placed by Pindar on the same level as the Lacedæmonian kings²—would have admitted this Thesprotian origin; nor does it coincide with the tenor of those legends which make the eponym, Thessalus, son of Hêraklês. Moreover, it is to be remarked that the language of the Thessalians was Hellenic, a variety of the Æolic dialect;³ the same (so far as we can make out) as that of the people whom they must have found settled in the country at their first conquest. If then it be true, that at some period anterior to the commencement of authentic history, a body of Thesprotian warriors crossed the passes of Pindus, and established themselves as conquerors in Thessaly, we must suppose them to have been more warlike than numerous, and to have gradually dropt their primitive language.

In other respects, the condition of the population of Thessaly, such as we find it during the historical period, favours the supposition of an original mixture of conquerors and conquered: for it seems that there was among the Thessalians and their dependents a triple gradation, somewhat analogous to that of Laconia. First, a class of rich proprietors distributed throughout the principal cities, possessing most of the soil, and constituting separate oligarchies loosely hanging together.⁴ Next the subject Achæans, Magnètes, Perrhæbi, different from the Laconian Perioeci in this point, that they retained their ancient tribe-name and separate Amphiktyonic franchise. Thirdly, a class of serfs or dependent cultivators, corresponding to the Laconian Helots, who tilling the lands of the wealthy oligarchs, paid over a proportion of its produce, furnished the retainers by which these great families were surrounded, served as their followers in the cavalry, and were in a condition of villenage,—yet with the important reserve that they could not be sold out of the country,⁵ that they had a permanent tenure in the soil,

¹ Herodot. vii. 176; Thucyd. i. 12.

² Pindar, *Pyth.* x. init. with the Scholia, and the valuable comment of Boeckh, in reference to the Aleuadæ; Schneider ad Aristot. *Polit.* v. 5, 9; and the Essay of Buttmann, *Von dem Geschlecht der Aleuaden*, art. xxii. vol. ii. p. 254, of the collection called “*Mythologus*.”

³ Ahrens, *De Dialect. Æolica*, c. 1, 2.

⁴ See Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 6, 3; Thucyd. ii. 99–100.

⁵ The words ascribed by Xenophon (*Hellen.* vi. 1, 11) to Jason of Pheræ, and the lines of Theocritus (*xvi.* 34), attest the numbers and vigour of the Thessalian Penestæ, and the great wealth of the Aleuadæ and Skopadæ. Both these families acquired celebrity from the verses of Simonides; he was patronised

and that they maintained among one another the relations of family and village. This last-mentioned order of men, in Thessaly called the Penestæ, is assimilated by all ancient authors to the Helots of Laconia, and in both cases the danger attending such a social arrangement is noticed by Plato and Aristotle. For the Helots as well as the Penestæ had their own common language and mutual sympathies, a separate residence, arms, and courage; to a certain extent, also, they possessed the means of acquiring property, since we are told that some of the Penestæ were richer than their masters.¹ So many means of action, combined with a degraded social position, gave rise to frequent revolt and incessant apprehensions. As a general rule, indeed, the cultivation of the soil by slaves or dependents, for the benefit of proprietors in the cities, prevailed throughout most parts of Greece. The rich men of Thebes, Argos, Athens or Elis, must have derived their incomes in the same manner; but it seems that there was often in other places a larger intermixture of bought foreign slaves, and also that the number, fellow-feeling and courage of the degraded village population was nowhere so great as in Thessaly and Laconia. Now the origin of the Penestæ in Thessaly is ascribed to the conquest of the territory by the Thesprotians, as that of the Helots in Laconia is traced to the Dorian conquest. The victors in both countries are said to have entered into a convention with the vanquished population, whereby the latter became serfs and tillers of the land for the benefit of the former, but were at the same time protected in their holdings, constituted subjects of the state, and secured against being sold away as slaves. Even in the Thessalian cities, though inhabited in common by Thessalian proprietors and their Penestæ, the quarters assigned to each were

Condition of the population of Thessaly—a villain race—the Penestæ.

and his muse invoked by both of them; see Ælian, V. H. xii. 1; Ovid, Ibis, 512; Quintilian, xi. 2, 15. Pindar also boasts of his friendship with Thorax the Aleuad (Pyth. x. 99).

The Thessalian ἀνδραποδισταί alluded to in Aristophanês (Plutus, 521) must have sold men out of the country for slaves—either refractory Penestæ, or Perrhæbian, Magnetic, and Achæan freemen, seized by violence: the Athenian comic poet Mnêsimachus, in jesting on the voracity of the Pharsalians, exclaims, ap. Athenæ. x. p. 418—

ἀρά που
ὀπτήν κατεσθίουσι πόλιν Ἀχαϊκήν.

Pagassæ was celebrated as a place of

export for slaves (Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. 49).

Menôn of Pharsalus assisted the Athenians against Amphipolis with 200 or 300, "Penestæ on horseback, of his own"—(Πενέσταις ἰδίοις) Demosthen. περὶ Συνταξ. c. 9, p. 173, cont. Aristokrat. c. 51, p. 687.

¹ Archemachus ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 264; Plato, Legg. vi. p. 777; Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 3, vii. 9, 9; Dionys. Halic. A. R. ii. 84.

Both Plato and Aristotle insist on the extreme danger of having numerous slaves, fellow-countrymen and of one language—(ὁμόφυλοι, ὁμόφωνοι, πατρίωται ἀλλήλων).

to a great degree separated: what was called the Free Agora could not be trodden by any Penest except when specially summoned.¹

Who the people were, whom the conquest of Thessaly by the Thesprotians reduced to this predial villenage, we find differently stated. According to Theopompus, they were Perrhæbians and Magnètes; according to others, Pelasgians; while Archemachus alleged them to have been Bœotians of the territory of Arnê²—some emigrating to escape the conquerors, others remaining and accepting the condition of serfs. But the conquest, assuming it as a fact, occurred at far too early a day to allow of our making out either the manner in which it came to pass or the state of things which preceded it. The Pelasgians whom Herodotus saw at Krêstôn are affirmed by him to have been the descendants of those who quitted Thessaly to escape³ the invading Thesprotians; though others held that the Bœotians, driven on this occasion from their habitations on the Gulf of Pagasæ near the Achæans of Phthiôtis, precipitated themselves on Orchomenus and Bœotia, and settled in it, expelling the Minyæ and the Pelasgians.

Passing over the legends on this subject, and confining ourselves to historical time, we find an established quadruple division of Thessaly, said to have been introduced in the time of Aleuas, the ancestor (real or mythical) of the powerful Aleuadae,—Thessaliôtis, Pelasgiôtis, Histiaëôtis Phthiôtis.⁴ In Phthiôtis were comprehended the Achæans, whose chief towns were Melitæa, Itônus, Thebæ Phthiôtides, Alos, Larissa Kremastê and Pteleon, on or near the western coast of the Gulf of Pagasæ. His-

¹ Aristot. Polit. vii. 11, 2.

² Theopompus and Archemachus ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 264–266; compare Thucyd. ii. 12; Steph. Byz. v. Ἀρνὴ—the converse of this story in Strabo, ix. p. 401–411, of the Thessalian Arnê being settled from Bœotia. That the villeins or Penestæ were completely distinct from the circumjacent dependents—Achæans, Magnètes, Perrhæbians, we see by Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 3. They had their eponymous hero Penestês, whose descent was traced to Thessalus son of Hêraklês: they were thus connected with the mythical father of the nation (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1271).

³ Herodot. i. 57: compare vii. 176.

⁴ Hellanikus, Fragm. 28, ed. Didot; Harpocration, v. Τετραρχία: the quadruple division was older than Hekataëus

(Steph. Byz. v. Κράννων).

Hekataëus connected the Perrhæbians with the genealogy of Æolus through Tyrô the daughter of Salmôneus: they passed as Αἰολεῖς (Hekataëus, Frag. 334, ed. Didot; Stephan. Byz. v. Φάλαρρα and Γόννοι).

The territory of the city of Histiaæa (in the north part of the island of Eubœa) was also called Histiaëôtis. The double occurrence of this name (no uncommon thing in ancient Greece) seems to have given rise to the statement, that the Perrhæbi had subdued the northern parts of Eubœa, and carried over the inhabitants of the Eubœan Histiaæa captive into the north-west of Thessaly (Strabo, ix. p. 437, x. p. 446).

tiæôtis, to the north of the Peneius, comprised the Perrhæbians with numerous towns strong in situation, but of no great size or importance; they occupied the passes of Olympus¹ and are sometimes considered as extending westward across Pindus. Pelasgiôtis included the Magnêtes, together with that which was called the Pelasgic plain bordering on the western side of Pelion and Ossa.² Thessaliôtis comprised the central plain of Thessaly and the upper course of the river Peneius. This was the political classification of the Thessalian power, framed to suit a time when the separate cities were maintained in harmonious action by favourable circumstances or by some energetic individual ascendancy; for their union was in general interrupted and disorderly, and we find certain cities standing aloof while the rest went to war.³ Though a certain political junction, and obligations of some kind towards a common authority, were recognised in theory by all, and a chief or Tagus⁴ was nominated to enforce obedience,—yet it frequently happened that the disputes of the cities among themselves prevented the choice of a Tagus, or drove him out of the country, and left the alliance little more than nominal. Larissa, Pharsalus⁵ and Pheræ—each with its cluster of dependent towns as adjuncts—seem to have been nearly on a par in strength, and each torn by intestine faction, so that not only was the supremacy over common dependents relaxed, but even the means of repelling invaders greatly enfeebled. The dependence of the Perrhæbians, Magnêtes, Achæans, and Malians, might under these circumstances be often loose and easy. But the condition of the Penestæ—who occupied the villages belonging to these great cities, in the central plain of Pelasgiôtis and Thessaliôtis, and from whom the Aleuadæ and Skopadæ derived their exuberance of landed produce—was noway mitigated, if it was not even aggravated, by such constant factions. Nor were there wanting cases in which the discontent of this subject class was employed by members of the native oligarchy,⁶ or even by foreign states, for the purpose of bringing about political revolutions.

Disorderly
confederacy
of the Thes-
salian cities.

¹ Pliny, H. N. iv. 1; Strabo, ix. p. 440.

² Strabo, ix. p. 443.

³ Diodor. xviii. 11; Thucyd. ii. 22.

⁴ The inscription No. 1770 in Boeckh's Corpus Inscript. contains a letter of the Roman consul, Titus Quinctius Flamininus, addressed to the city of Kyretiæ (north of Atrax in Perrhæbia). The letter is addressed, *Κυρετιέων τοῖς ταγοῖς καὶ τῇ πόλει*—the title of Tagi seems

thus to have been given to the magistrates of separate Thessalian cities. The Inscriptions of Thaumaki (No. 1773–1774) have the title *ἄρχοντες*, not *ταγοί*. The title *ταγὸς* was peculiar to Thessaly (Pollux, i. 128).

⁵ Xenophon, Hellen. vi. 1, 9; Diodor. xiv. 82; Thucyd. i. 3. Herod. vii. 6, calls the Aleuadæ *Θεσσαλῆς βασιλῆς*.

⁶ Xenophon, Memorab. i. 2, 24; Hellenic. ii. 3, 37. The loss of the comedy

“When Thessaly is under her Tagus, all the neighbouring people pay tribute to her; she can send into the field 6000 cavalry and 10,000 hoplites or heavy-armed infantry,”¹ observed Jason, despot of Pheræ, to Polydamas of Pharsalus, in endeavouring to prevail on the latter to second his pretensions to that dignity. The impost due from the tributaries, seemingly considerable, was then realised with arrears, and the duties upon imports at the harbours of the Pagasæan gulf, imposed for the benefit of the confederacy, were then enforced with strictness; but the observation shows that while unanimous Thessaly was very powerful, her periods of unanimity were only occasional.² Among the nations which thus paid tribute to the fulness of Thessalian power, we may number not merely the Perrhæbi, Magnêtes, and Achæans of Phthiôtis, but also the Malians and Dolopes, and various tribes of Epirots extending to the westward of Pindus.³ We may remark that they were all (except the Malians) javelinmen or light-armed troops, not serving in rank with the full panoply; a fact which in Greece counts as presumptive evidence of a lower civilization; the Magnêtes, too, had a peculiar close-fitting mode of dress, probably suited to movements in a mountainous country.⁴ There was even a time when the Thessalian power threatened to extend southward of Thermopylæ, subjugated the Phokians, Dorians and Lokrians. So much were the Phokians alarmed at this danger, that they had built a wall across the pass of Thermopylæ for the purpose of more easily defending it against Thessalian invaders, who are reported to have penetrated more than once into the Phokian valleys, and to have sustained some severe defeats.⁵ At what precise time these events happened, we find no information; but it must have been considerably earlier than the invasion of Xerxes, since the defensive wall which had been built at Thermopylæ by the Phokians was found by Leonidas

called Πόλεις of Eupolis (see Meineke, *Fragm. Comicor. Græc.* p. 513) probably prevents us from understanding the sarcasm of Aristophanês (*Vesp.* 1263) about the παραπρέσβεια of Æmynias among the Penestæ of Pharsalus; but the incident there alluded to can have nothing to do with the proceedings of Kritias, touched upon by Xenophon.

¹ Xenophon, *Hellen.* vi. 1, 9–12.

² Demosthen. *Olynth.* i. c. 3, p. 15, ii. c. 5, p. 21. The orator had occasion to denounce Philip as having got possession of the public authority of the

Thessalian confederation, partly by intrigue, partly by force, and we thus hear of the λιμένες and the ἀγοραί which formed the revenue of the confederacy.

³ Xenophon (*Hellen.* vi. 1, 7) numbers the Μαρακοί among these tributaries along with the Dolopes: the Maraces are named by Pliny (*H. N.* iv. 3) also along with the Dolopes, but we do not know where they dwelt.

⁴ Xenophon. *Hellen.* vi. 1, 9; Pindar, *Pyth.* iv. 80.

⁵ Herodot. vii. 176; viii. 27–28.

in a state of ruin. But the Phokians, though they no longer felt the necessity of keeping up this wall, had not ceased to fear and hate the Thessalians—an antipathy which will be found to manifest itself palpably in connexion with the Persian invasion. On the whole the resistance of the Phokians was successful, for the power of the Thessalians never reached southward of the pass.¹

It will be recollected that these different ancient races,—Per-rhæbi, Magnêtes, Achæans, Malians, Dolopes,—though tributaries of the Thessalians, still retained their Amphiktyonic franchise, and were considered as legitimate Hellenes: all except the Malians are indeed mentioned in the Iliad. We shall rarely have occasion to speak much of them in the course of this history: they are found siding with Xerxes (chiefly by constraint) in his attack of Greece, and almost indifferent in the struggle between Sparta and Athens. That the Achæans of Phthiôtis are a portion of the same race as the Achæans of Peloponnesus it seems reasonable to believe, though we trace no historical evidence to authenticate it. Achæa Phthiôtis is the seat of Hellên, the patriarch of the entire race,—of the primitive Hellas, by some treated as a town, by others as a district of some breadth,—and of the great national hero Achilles. Its connexion with the Peloponnesian Achæans is not unlike that of Doris with the Peloponnesian Dorians.²

We have also to notice another ethnical kindred, the date and circumstances of which are given to us only in a mythical form, but which seems nevertheless to be in itself a reality,—that of the Magnêtes on Pelion and Ossa, with the two divisions of Asiatic Magnêtes, or Magnesia on Mount Sipylus and Magnesia on the river Mæander. It is said that these two Asiatic homonymous towns were founded by migrations of the Thessalian Magnêtes, a body of whom became consecrated to the Asiatic Delphian god, and chose a new abode under his directions. According to one story, these emigrants were warriors returning from the siege of Troy; according to another, they sought fresh seats to escape from the Thresprotian conquerors of Thessaly. There was a third story, according to which the Thessalian Magnêtes themselves were represented as colonists³ from Delphi.

¹ The story of invading Thessalians at Kerêssus near Leuktra in Boeotia (Pausan. ix. 13, 1) is not at all probable.

of Phthia went into Peloponnesus with Pelops, and settled in Laconia (Strabo, viii. p. 365).

² Aristoteles ap. Athenæ. iv. p. 173; Conon, Narrat. 29; Strabo, xiv. p. 647.

³ One story was, that these Achæans

Achæans,
Per-rhæbi,
Magnêtes,
Malians,
Dolopes, &c.,
all tributaries
of the Thes-
salians, but
all Amphi-
ktyonic races.

Asiatic
Magnêtes.

Though we can elicit no distinct matter of fact from these legends, we may nevertheless admit the connexion of race between the Thessalian and the Asiatic Magnètes as well as the reverential dependence of both, manifested in this supposed filiation, on the temple of Delphi. Of the Magnètes in Krete, noticed by Plato as long extinct in his time, we cannot absolutely verify even the existence.

Of the Malians, Thucydides notices three tribes (γέννη) as existing in his time—the Paralii, the Hierês (Priests), and the Trachinii, or men of Trachin:¹ it is possible that the second of the two may have been possessors of the sacred spot on which the Amphiktyonic meetings were held. The prevalence of the hoplites or heavy-armed infantry among the Malians indicates that we are stepping from Thessalian to more southerly Hellenic habits: the Malians recognized every man as a qualified citizen who either had served, or was serving, in the ranks with his full panoply.² Yet the panoply was probably not perfectly suitable to the mountainous regions by which they were surrounded; for at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, the aggressive mountaineers of the neighbouring region of Æta had so harassed and overwhelmed them in war, that they were forced to throw themselves on the protection of Sparta, and the establishment of the Spartan colony of Herakleia near Trachni was the result of their urgent application. Of these mountaineers, described under the general name of Ætæans, the principal were the Ænians (or Eniènes, as they are termed in the Homeric Catalogue as well as by Herodotus),—an ancient Hellenic³ Amphiktyonic race, who are said to have passed through

The Malians.

The Ætæi.

—The Ænians.

Hoeck (Kreta, b. iii. vol. ii. p. 409) attempts (unsuccessfully, in my judgment) to reduce these stories into the form of substantial history.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 92. The distinction made by Skylax (c. 61) and Diodorus (xviii. 11) between Μηλιείς and Μαλιείς—the latter adjoining the former on the north—appears inadmissible, though Letronne still defends it (Périphe de Marcien d'Héracée, &c., Paris, 1839, p. 212).

Instead of Μαλιείς, we ought to read Λαμιείς, as O. Müller observes (Dorians, i. 6, p. 48).

It is remarkable that the important town of Lamia (the modern Zeitun) is not noticed either by Herodotus, Thucydides or Xenophon; Skylax is the first who mentions it. The route of Xerxes towards Thermopylæ lay along

the coast from Alos.

The Lamieis (assuming that to be the correct reading) occupied the northern coast of the Maliac Gulf, from the north bank of the Spercheius to the town of Echinus; in which position Dr. Cramer places the Μηλιείς Παράλιοι—an error, I think (Geography of Greece, vol. i. p. 436).

It is not improbable that Lamia first acquired importance during the course of those events towards the close of the Peloponnesian war, when the Lacedæmonians, in defence of Herakleia, attacked the Achæans of Phthiôtis, and even expelled the Ætæans for a time from their seats (see Thucyd. viii. 3; Diodor. xiv. 38).

² Aristot. Polit. iv. 10, 10.

³ Plutarch, Quæstion. Græc. p. 294.

several successive migrations in Thessaly and Epirus, but who in the historical times had their settlement and their chief town Hypata in the upper valley of the Spercheius, on the northern declivity of Mount Ceta. But other tribes were probably also included in the name, such as those Ætolian tribes, the Bomians and Kallians, whose high and cold abodes approached near to the Maliac Gulf. It is in this sense that we are to understand the name, as comprehending all the predatory tribes along this extensive mountain range, when we are told of the damage done by the Cætæans both to the Malians on the east, and to the Dorians on the south: but there are some cases in which the name Cætæans seems to designate expressly the Ænians, especially when they are mentioned as exercising the Amphiktyonic franchise.¹

The fine soil, abundant moisture, and genial exposure of the southerly declivities of Othrys²—especially the valley of the Spercheius, through which river all these waters pass away, and which annually gives forth a fertilising inundation—present a marked contrast with the barren, craggy, and naked masses of Mount Ceta, which forms one side of the pass of Thermopylæ. Southward of the pass, the Lokrians, Phokians, and Dorians occupied the mountains and passes between Thessaly and Bœotia. Lokrians,
Phokians,
Dorians. The coast opposite to the western side of Eubœa, from the neighbourhood of Thermopylæ as far as the Bœotian frontier at Anthêdôn, was possessed by the Lokrians, whose northern frontier town, Alpêni, was conterminous with the Malians. There was, however, one narrow strip of Phokis—the town of Daphnus, where the Phokians also touched the Eubœan sea—which broke this continuity and divided the Lokrians into two sections,—Lokrians of Mount Knêmis, or Epiknemidian Lokrians, and Lokrians of Opus, or Opuntian Lokrians. The mountain called Knêmis, running southward parallel to the coast from the end of Ceta, divided the former section from the inland Phokians and the upper valley of the Kephisus: farther southward, joining continuously with Mount Ptôon by means of an intervening mountain which is now called Chlomo, it separated the Lokrians of Opus from the territories of Orchomenus,

¹ Thucyd. iii. 92–97; viii. 3. Xenoph. Hellen. i. 2, 18; in another passage Xenophon expressly distinguishes the Cætæi and the Ænians (Hellen. iii. 5, 6). Diodor. xiv. 38. Æschines, De Fals. Leg. c. 44, p. 290.

² About the fertility as well as the beauty of this valley, see Dr. Holland's Travels, ch. xvii. vol. ii. p. 108, and

Forchhammer (Hellenika, Griechenland, im Neuen das Alte, Berlin, 1837). I do not concur with Forchhammer in his attempts to resolve the mythes of Hêraklês, Achilles, and others into physical phenomena; but his descriptions of local scenery and attributes are most vivid and masterly.

Thebes, and Anthêdôn, the north-eastern portions of Bœotia. Besides these two sections of the Lokrian name, there was also a third, completely separate, and said to have been colonised out from Opus,—the Lokrians surnamed Ozolæ,—who dwelt apart on the western side of Phokis, along the northern coast of the Corinthian Gulf. They reached from Amphissa—which overhung the plain of Krissa, and stood within seven miles of Delphi—to Nau-paktus, near the narrow entrance of the Gulf; which latter town was taken from these Lokrians by the Athenians a little before the Peloponnesian war. Opus prided itself on being the mother-city of the Lokrian name, and the legends of Deukaliôn and Pyrrha found a home there as well as in Phthiôtis. Alpeni, Nikæa, Thronium, and Skarpheia, were towns, ancient but unimportant, of the Epiknemidian Lokrians; but the whole length of this Lokrian coast is celebrated for its beauty and fertility, both by ancient and modern observers.¹

The Phokians were bounded on the north by the little territories called Doris and Dryopis, which separated them from the Malians,—on the north-east, east, and south-west by the different branches of Lokrians,—and on the south-east by the Bœotians. They touched the Eubœan sea (as has been mentioned) at Daphnus, the point where it approaches nearest to their chief town Elateia; their territory also comprised most part of the lofty and bleak range of Parnassus as far as its southerly termination, where a lower portion of it, called Kirphis, projects into the Corinthian Gulf, between the two bays of Antikyra and Krissa; the latter, with its once fertile plain, was in proximity to the sacred rock of the Delphian Apollo. Both Delphi and Krissa originally belonged to the Phokian race. But the sanctity of the temple, together with Lacedæmonian aid, enabled the Delphians to set up for themselves, disavowing their connexion with the Phokian brotherhood. Territorially speaking, the most valuable part of Phokis² consisted in the valley of the river Kephisus, which takes its rise

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 425; Forchhammer, *Hellenika*, p. 11–12. Kynus is sometimes spoken of as the harbour of Opus, but it was a city of itself as old as the Homeric Catalogue, and of some moment in the later wars of Greece, when military position came to be more valued than legendary celebrity (Livy, xxviii. 6; Pausan. x. 1, 1; Skylax, c. 61–62); the latter counts Thronium and Knêmis or Knêmidēs as being Phokian, not Lokrian; which they were for

a short time during the prosperity of the Phokians at the beginning of the Sacred War, though not permanently (Æschin. Fals. Legat. c. 42, p. 46). This serves as one presumption about the age of the Periplus of Skylax (see the notes of Klausen ad Skyl. p. 269). These Lokrian towns lay along the important road from Thermopylæ to Elateia and Bœotia (Pausan. vii. 15, 2; Livy, xxxiii. 3).

² Pausan. x. 33, 4.

from Parnassus not far from the Phokian town of Lilæa, passes between Ceta and Knêmis on one side and Parnassus on the other, and enters Bœotia near Chæroneia, discharging itself into the lake Kôpaïs. It was on the projecting mountain ledges and rocks on each side of this river that the numerous little Phokian towns were situated. Twenty-two of them were destroyed and broken up into villages by the Amphiktyonic order after the second Sacred War; Abæ (one of the few, if not the only one, that was spared) being protected by the sanctity of its temple and oracle. Of these cities the most important was Elateia, situated on the left bank of the Kephissus, and on the road from Lokris into Phokis, in the natural march of an army from Thermopylæ into Bœotia. The Phokian towns¹ were embodied in an ancient confederacy, which held its periodical meetings at a temple between Daulis and Delphi.

The little territory called Doris and Dryopis occupied the southern declivity of Mount Ceta, dividing Phokis on the north and north-west from the Ætolians, Ænians, <sup>Doris—
Dryopis.</sup> and Malians. That which was called Doris in the historical times, and which reached, in the time of Herodotus, nearly as far eastward as the Maliac Gulf, is said to have formed a part of what had been once called Dryopis; a territory which had comprised the summit of Ceta as far as the Spercheius northward, and which had been inhabited by an old Hellenic tribe called Dryopes. The Dorians acquired their settlement in Dryopis by gift from Hêraklês, who along with the Malians (so ran the legend) had expelled the Dryopes, and compelled them to find for themselves new seats at Hermionê and Asinê, in the Argolic peninsula of Peloponnesus—at Styra and Karystus in Eubœa—and in the island of Kythnus;² it is only in these five last-mentioned places that history <sup>Historical
Dryopes.</sup> recognises them. The territory of Doris was distributed into four little townships—Pindus or Akyphas, Bœon, Kytinion, and Erineon—each of which seems to have occupied a separate

¹ Pausan. x. 5, 1; Demosth. Fals. Leg. c. 22–28; Diodor. xvi. 60, with the note of Wesseling.

The tenth book of Pausanias, though the larger half of it is devoted to Delphi, tells us all that we know respecting the less important towns of Phokis. Compare also Dr. Cramer's Geography of Greece, vol. ii. sect. 10; and Leake's Travels in Northern Greece, vol. ii. ch.

13.

Two funeral monuments of the Phokian hero Schedius (who commands the Phokian troops before Troy and is slain

in the Iliad) marked the two extremities of Phokis, —one at Daphnus on the Eubœan sea, the other at Antikyra on the Corinthian Gulf (Strabo, ix. p. 425; Pausan. x. 36, 4).

² Herodot. viii. 31, 43, 46; Diodor. iv. 57; Aristot. ap. Strabo, viii. p. 373.

O. Müller (History of the Dorians, book i. ch. ii.) has given all that can be known about Doris and Dryopis, together with some matters which appear to me very inadequately authenticated.

valley belonging to one of the feeders of the river Kephissus—the only narrow spaces of cultivated ground which this “small and sad” region presented.¹ In itself this tetrapolis is so insignificant, that we shall rarely find occasion to mention it: but it acquired a factitious consequence by being regarded as the metropolis of the great Dorian cities in Peloponnesus, and receiving on that ground special protection from Sparta. I do not here touch upon that string of ante-historical migrations—stated by Herodotus and illustrated by the ingenuity as well as decorated by the fancy of O. Müller—through which the Dorians are affiliated with the patriarch of the Hellenic race—moving originally out of Phthiôtis to Histiaëôtis, then to Pindus, and lastly to Doris. The residence of Dorians in Doris is a fact which meets us at the commencement of history, like that of the Phokians and Lokrians in their respective territories.

We next pass to the Ætolians, whose extreme tribes covered the bleak heights of Æta and Korax, reaching almost within sight of the Maliac Gulf, where they bordered on the Dorians and Malians—while their central and western tribes stretched along the frontier of the Ozolian Lokrians to the flat plain, abundant in marsh and lake, near the mouth of the Euênus. In the time of Herodotus and Thucydides they do not seem to have extended so far westward as the Achelôus; but in later times this latter river, throughout the greater part of its lower course, divided them from the Akarnanians:² on the north they touched upon the Dolopians and upon a parallel of latitude nearly as far north as Ambrakia. There were three great divisions of the Ætolian name—the Apodôti, Ophioneis, and Eurytanes—each of which was subdivided into several different village tribes. The northern and eastern portion of the territory³ consisted of very high mountain ranges, and even in the southern portion, the mountains Arakynthus, Kurion, Chalkis, Taphiassus, are found at no great distance from the sea; while the chief towns in Ætolia—Kalydôn, Pleurôn, Chalkis,—seem to have been situated eastward of the

¹ Πόλεις μικραὶ καὶ λυπρόχωροι, Strabo, ix. p. 427.

² Herod. vii. 126; Thucyd. ii. 102.

³ See the difficult journey of Fiedler from Wrachori northward by Karpenitz, and then across the north-western portion of the mountains of the ancient Eurytanes (the southern continuation of Mount Tymphrêstus and Æta), into the upper valley of the Spercheius

(Fiedler's Reise in Griechenland, vol. i. p. 177–191), a part of the longer journey from Missolonghi to Zeitun.

Skylax (c. 35) reckons Ætolia as extending inland as far as the boundaries of the Ænians on the Spercheius—which is quite correct—Ætolia Epiiktêtus—μέχρι τῆς Οἰτάλας, Strabo, x. p. 450.

Euênus, between the last-mentioned mountains and the sea.¹ The first two towns have been greatly ennobled in legend, but are little named in history; while on the contrary, Thermus, the chief town of the historical Ætoliæ, and the place where the aggregate meeting and festival of the Ætolian name, for the choice of a Pan-Ætolic general, was convoked, is not noticed by any one earlier than Ephorus.² It was partly legendary renown, partly ethnical kindred (publicly acknowledged on both sides) with the Eleians in Peloponnesus, which authenticated the title of the Ætoliæ to rank as Hellens. But the great mass of the Apodôti, Eurytanes, and Ophioneis, in the inland mountains, were so rude in their manners and so unintelligible³ in their speech (which, however, was not barbaric, but very bad Hellenic), that this title might well seem disputable—in point of fact it was disputed in later times, when the Ætolian power and depredations had become obnoxious nearly to all Greece. And it is probably to this difference of manners between the Ætoliæ on the sea-coast and those in the interior, that we are to trace a geographical division mentioned by Strabo into Ancient Ætolia, and Ætolia Epiktêtus (or acquired). When or by whom this division was introduced, we do not know. It cannot be founded upon any conquest, for the inland Ætoliæ were the most unconquerable of mankind: and the affirmation which Ephorus applied to the whole Ætolian race—that it had never been reduced to subjection by any one—is most of all beyond dispute concerning the inland portion of it.⁴

Adjoining the Ætoliæ were the Akarnaniæ, the westernmost of extra-Peloponnesian Greeks. They extended to the Ionian Sea, and seem, in the time of Thucydides, to have occupied both banks of the river Achelôus in the lower part of its course—though the left bank appears afterwards as belonging to

The Akarnanians.

¹ Strabo, x. p. 459-460. There is however great uncertainty about the position of these ancient towns: compare Kruse, *Hellas*, vol. iii. ch. xi. p. 233-255, and Brandstätter, *Geschichte des Ætolischen Landes*, p. 121-134.

² Ephorus, *Fragm.* 29, Marx. ap. Strabo, p. 463. The situation of Thermus, "the acropolis as it were of all Ætolia," and placed on a spot almost unapproachable by an army, is to a certain extent, though not wholly, capable of being determined by the description which Polybius gives of the rapid march of Philip and the Macedonian army to surprise it. The maps, both of Kruse

and Kiepert, place it too much on the north of the lake Trichônis: the map of Fiedler notes it more correctly to the east of that lake (Polyb. v. 7-8; compare Brandstätter, *Geschichte des Ætol. Landes*, p. 133).

³ Thucyd. iii. 102.—ἀγνωστότατοι δὲ γλῶσσάν εἰσι, καὶ ὁμόφαγοι ὥς λέγουται. It seems that Thucydides had not himself seen or conversed with them, but he does not call them βάρβαροι.

⁴ Ephorus, *Fragment.* 29, ed. Marx: Skymn. Chius, v. 471; Strabo, x. p. 450.

the Ætoliæ, so that the river came to constitute the boundary, often disputed and decided by arms, between them. The principal Akarnanian towns, Stratus and Cœniadæ, were both on the right bank; the latter on the marshy and overflowed land near its mouth. Near the Akarnanians, towards the Gulf of Ambrakia, were found barbarian or non-Hellenic nations—the Agræans and the Amphilocheians: in the midst of the latter, on the shores of the Ambrakian Gulf, the Greek colony called Argos Amphilocheicum was established.

Of the five Hellenic subdivisions now enumerated—Lokrians, Phokians, Dorians (of Doris), Ætoliæ, and Akarnanians (of whom Lokrians, Phokians and Ætoliæ are comprised in the Homeric catalogue)—we have to say the same as of those north of Thermopylæ: there is no information respecting them from the commencement of the historical period down to the Persian war. Even that important event brings into action only the Lokrians of the Eubœan Sea, the Phokians, and the Dorians: we have to wait until near the Peloponnesian war before we require information respecting the Ozolian Lokrians, the Ætoliæ, and the Akarnanians. These

Ozolian
Lokrians,
Ætoliæ,
and Akar-
nanians,
were the
rudest of
all Greeks.

last three were unquestionably the most backward members of the Hellenic aggregate. Though not absolutely without a central town, they lived dispersed in villages, retiring, when attacked, to inaccessible heights, perpetually armed and in readiness for aggression and plunder wherever they found an opportunity.¹ Very different was the condition of the Lokrians opposite Eubœa, the Phokians, and the Dorians. These were all orderly town communities, small indeed and poor, but not less well-administered than the average of Grecian townships, and perhaps exempt from those individual violences which so frequently troubled the Bœotian Thebes or the great cities of Thessaly. Timæus affirmed (contrary, as it seems, to the supposition of Aristotle) that in early times there were no slaves either among the Lokrians or Phokians, and that the work required to be done for proprietors was performed by poor freemen;² a habit which is alleged to have been continued until the temporary prosperity of the Sacred War, when the plunder of the Delphian temple so greatly enriched the Phokian leaders. But this statement is

¹ Thucyd. i. 6; iii. 94. Aristotle, however, included in his large collection of Πολιτεῖαι, an Ἀκαρνάνων Πολιτεία as well as an Αἰτωλῶν Πολιτεία (Aristotelis Rerum Publicarum Reli-

quæ, ed. Neumann, p. 102; Strabo, vii. p. 321).

² Timæus, Fragm. xvii. ed. Gölher; Polyb. xii. 6-7; Athenæus, vi. p. 264.

too briefly given, and too imperfectly authenticated, to justify any inferences.

We find in the poet Alkman (about 610 B.C.) the Erysichæan or Kalydonian shepherd named as a type of rude rusticity—the antithesis of Sardis, where the poet was born.¹ And among the suitors who are represented as coming forward to claim the daughter of the Sikyonian Kleisthenes in marriage, there appears both the Thessalian Diaktoridês from Krannôn, a member of the Skopad family—and the Ætolian Malês, brother of that Titormus who in muscular strength surpassed all his contemporary Greeks, and who had seceded from mankind into the inmost recesses of Ætolia: this Ætolian seems to be set forth as a sort of antithesis to the delicate Smindyridês of Sybaris, the most luxurious of mankind. Herodotus introduces these characters into his dramatic picture of this memorable wedding.²

Between Phokis and Lokris on one side, and Attica (from which it is divided by the mountains Kithærôn and Parnês) on the other, we find the important territory called Bœotia, The Bœo-
tians. with its ten or twelve autonomous cities, forming a sort of confederacy under the presidency of Thebes, the most powerful among them. Even of this territory, destined during the second period of this history to play a part so conspicuous and effective, we know nothing during the first two centuries after 776 B.C. We first acquire some insight into it on occasion of the disputes between Thebes and Plataea about the year 520 B.C. Orchomenus, on the north-west of the lake Kôpais, forms throughout the historical times one of the cities of the Bœotian league, seemingly the second after Thebes. But I have already stated that the Orchomenian legends, the Catalogue and other allusions in Homer, and the traces of vast power and importance yet visible in the historical age, attest the early political existence of Orchomenus and its neighbourhood apart from Bœotia.³ The Amphiktyony in which

¹ This brief fragment of the *Ναυθε-
νεία* of Alkman is preserved by Stephan.
Byz. (*Ἐρυσίχην*), and alluded to by
Strabo, x. p. 460: see Welcker, *Alkm.*
Fragm. xi. and Bergk, *Alk. Fr.* xii.

² Herodot. vi. 127.

³ See an admirable topographical description of the north part of Bœotia—the lake Kôpais and its environs, in Forchhammer's *Hellenika*, p. 159–186, with an explanatory map. The two long and laborious tunnels constructed by the old Orchomenians for the drain-

age of the lake, as an aid to the insufficiency of the natural Katabothra, are there very clearly laid down: one goes to the sea, the other into the neighbouring lake Hylika, which is surrounded by high rocky banks and can take more water without overflowing. The lake Kôpais is an enclosed basin receiving all the water from Doris and Phokis through the Kêphissus. A copy of Forchhammer's map will be found at the end of the present volume.

Forchhammer thinks that it was no-

Orchomenus participated at the holy island of Kalauria near the Argolic peninsula, seems to show that it must once have possessed a naval force and commerce, and that its territory must have touched the sea at Halæ and the lower town of Larymna, near the southern frontier of Lokris; this sea is separated by a very narrow space from the range of mountains which join Knêmis and Ptôon, and which enclose on the east both the basin of Orchomenus, Asplêdôn and Kôpæ, and the lake Kôpaïs. The migration of the Bœotians out of Thessaly into Bœotia (which is represented as a consequence of the conquest of the former country by the Thesprotians) is commonly assigned as the compulsory force which bœotised Orchomenus. By whatever cause or at whatever time (whether before or after 776 B.C.) the transition may have been effected, we find Orchomenus completely Bœotian throughout the known historical age—yet still retaining its local Minyeian legends, and subject to the jealous rivalry¹ of Thebes, as being the second city in the Bœotian league. The direct road from the passes of Phokis southward into Bœotia went through Chæroneia, leaving Lebadeia on the right and Orchomenus on the left hand, and passed the south-western edge of the lake Kôpaïs near the towns of Koroneia, Alalkomenæ, and Haliartus. Here stood, between Mount Helikon and the lake, on the road from Phokis to Thebes, the important military post called Tilphôssion.²

Cities of
Bœotia.

The territory of this latter city occupied the greater part of central Bœotia south of the lake Kôpaïs; it comprehended Akræphia and Mount Ptôon, and probably touched the Eubœan Sea at the village of Salganeus south of Anthêdôn. South-west of Thebes, bordering on the south-eastern extremity of Phokis with the Phokian town of Bulis, stood the city of Thespiæ. Southward of the Asôpus, but northward of Kithæron and Parnes, were Platæa and Tanagra: in the south-eastern corner of Bœotia stood Orôpus, the frequent subject of contention between Thebes and Athens; and in the road between the Eubœan Chalkis and Thebes, the town of Mykalêssus.

thing but the similarity of the name Itônea (derived from *itræa*, a willow-tree) which gave rise to the tale of an immigration of people from the Thessalian to the Bœotian Itônê (p. 148).

The Homeric Catalogue presents Kôpæ, on the north of the lake, as Bœotian, but not Orchomenus nor Asplêdôn (Iliad, ii. 502).

¹ See O. Müller, Orchomenos, cap. xx.

p. 418 seq.

² See Demosthen. De Fals. Legat. c. 43–45. Another portion of this narrow road is probably meant by the pass of Korôneia—τὰ περὶ Κορώνειαν στενὰ (Diodor. xv. 52; Xenoph. Hellen. iv. 3, 15)—which Epameinondas occupied to prevent the invasion of Kleombrotus from Phokis.

From our first view of historical Bœotia downward, there appears a confederation which embraces the whole territory; and during the Peloponnesian war the Thebans invoke “the ancient constitutional maxims of the Bœotians” as a justification of extreme rigour, as well as of treacherous breach of the peace, against the recusant Plateans.¹ Of this confederation the greater cities were primary members, while the lesser were attached to one or other of them in a kind of dependent union. Neither the names nor the number of these primary members can be certainly known: there seem grounds for including Thebes, Orchomenus, Lebadeia, Korôneia, Haliartus, Kôpæ, Anthêdôn, Tanagra, Thespiæ, and Plataea before its secession.² Akræphia with the neighbouring Mount Ptôon and its oracle, Skôlus, Glisas and other places, were dependencies of Thebes: Chæroneia, Asplêdôn, Holmônes and Hyêtus, of Orchomenus: Siphæ, Leuktra, Kerêssus and Thisbê, of Thespiæ.³ Certain generals or magistrates called Bœotarchs were chosen annually to manage the common affairs of the confederation. At the time of the battle of Delium in the Peloponnesian war, they were eleven in number, two of them from Thebes; but whether this number was always maintained, or in what proportions the choice was made by the different cities, we find no distinct information. There were likewise during the Peloponnesian war four different senates, with whom the Bœotarchs consulted on matters of importance; a curious arrangement, of which we have no explanation. Lastly, there was the general concilium and religious festival—the Pambœotia—held periodically at Korôneia. Such were the forms, as far as we can make them out, of the Bœotian confederacy; each of the separate cities possessing its own senate and constitution, and having its political consciousness as an autonomous unit, yet with a certain habitual deference to the federal obligations. Substantially, the affairs of the confederation will be found in the hands of Thebes, managed in the interests of Theban ascendancy, which appears to have been sustained by no other feeling except respect for superior force and bravery. The discontents of the minor Bœotian towns, harshly

¹ Thucyd. ii. 2—κατὰ τὰ πατρία τῶν πάντων Βωιωτῶν: compare the speech of the Thebans to the Lacedæmonians after the capture of Plataea, iii. 61, 63, 66.

² Thucyd. iv. 91; C. F. Hermann, Griechische Staats Alterthümer, sect. 179; Herodot. v. 79; Boeckh, Commen-

tat. ad Inscriptt. Bœotic. ap. Corp. Ins. Gr. part v. p. 726.

³ Herodot. viii. 135; ix. 15-43. Pausan. ix. 13, 1; ix. 23, 3; ix. 24, 3; ix. 32, 1-4. Xenophon, Hellen. vi. 4, 3-4: compare O. Müller, Orchomenos, cap. xx. p. 403.

repressed and punished, form an uninviting chapter in Grecian history.

One piece of information we find, respecting Thebes singly and apart from the other Bœotian towns, anterior to the year 700 B.C. Though brief and incompletely recorded, it is yet highly valuable, as one of the first incidents of solid and positive Grecian history. Dioklês the Corinthian stands enrolled as Olympic victor in the 13th Olympiad, or 728 B.C., at a time when the oligarchy called Bacchiadæ possessed the government of Corinth. The beauty of his person attracted towards him the attachment of Philolaus, one of the members of this oligarchical body,—a sentiment which Grecian manners did not proscribe; but it also provoked an incestuous passion on the part of his own mother Halkyonê, from which Dioklês shrunk with hatred and horror. He abandoned for ever his native city and retired to Thebes, whither he was followed by Philolaus, and where both of them lived and died. Their tombs were yet shown in the time of Aristotle, close adjoining to each other, yet with an opposite frontage; that of Philolaus being so placed that the inmate could command a view of the lofty peak of his native city, while that of Dioklês was so disposed as to block out all prospect of the hateful spot. That which preserves to us the memory of so remarkable an incident, is, the esteem entertained for Philolaus by the Thebans—a feeling so pronounced, that they invited him to make laws for them. We shall have occasion to point out one or two similar cases in which Grecian cities invoked the aid of an intelligent stranger; and the practice became common, among the Italian republics in the middle ages, to nominate a person not belonging to their city either as Podesta or as arbitrator in civil dissensions. It would have been highly interesting to know at length what laws Philolaus made for the Thebans; but Aristotle, with his usual conciseness, merely alludes to his regulations respecting the adoption of children and respecting the multiplication of offspring in each separate family. His laws were framed with the view to maintain the original number of lots of land, without either subdivision or consolidation; but by what means the purpose was to be fulfilled we are not informed.¹ There existed a law at Thebes,

¹ Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 6-7. Νομοθέτης δ' αὐτοῖς (to the Thebans) ἐγένετο Φιλόλαος περί τ' ἄλλων τινῶν καὶ περί τῆς παιδοποιίας, οὗς καλοῦσιν ἐκείνοι νόμους θετικούς· καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἰδίως ὑπ'

ἐκείνου νενομοθετημένον, ὅπως δ' ἀριθμὸς σῴζεται τῶν κλήρων. A perplexing passage follows within three lines of this—Φιλολάου δὲ ἴδιον ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν οὐσιῶν ἀνομάλωσις—which raises two questions:

which perhaps may have been part of the scheme of Philolaus, prohibiting exposure of children, and empowering a father under the pressure of extreme poverty to bring his new-born infant to the magistrates, who sold it for a price to any citizen-purchaser,—taking from him the obligation to bring it up, but allowing him in return to consider the adult as his slave.¹ From these brief allusions, coming to us without accompanying illustration, we can draw no other inference, except that the great problem of population—the relation between the well-being of the citizens and their more or less rapid increase in numbers—had engaged the serious attention even of the earliest Grecian legislators. We may however observe that the old Corinthian legislator Pheidôn (whose precise date cannot be fixed) is stated by Aristotle² to have contemplated much the same object as that which is ascribed to Philolaus at Thebes; an unchangeable number both of citizens and of lots of land, without any attempt to alter the unequal ratio of the lots, one to the other.

first, whether Philolaus can really be meant in the second passage, which talks of what is ἴδιον to Philolaus, while the first passage had already spoken of something ἰδίως νενομοθετημένον by the same person. Accordingly Göttling and M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire follow one of the MSS. by writing Φαλέου in place of Φιλολάου. Next, what is the meaning of ἀνομόλωσις? O. Müller (Dorians, ch. x. 5, p. 209) considers it to mean a “fresh equalisation, just as ἀναδασμὸς means a fresh division,” adopting the translation of Victorius and

Schlösser.

The point can hardly be decisively settled; but if this translation of ἀνομόλωσις be correct, there is good ground for preferring the word Φαλέου to Φιλολάου; since the proceeding described would harmonise better with the ideas of Phaleas (Aristot. Pol. ii. 4, 3).

¹ Ælian, V. H. ii. 7.

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 3, 7. This Pheidôn seems different from Pheidôn of Argos, as far as we are enabled to judge.

CHAPTER IV.

EARLIEST HISTORICAL VIEW OF PELOPONNESUS. DORIANS
IN ARGOS AND THE NEIGHBOURING CITIES.

WE now pass from the northern members to the heart and head of Greece—Peloponnesus and Attica, taking the former first in order, and giving as much as can be ascertained respecting its early historical phænomena.

The traveller who entered Peloponnesus from Bœotia during the youthful days of Herodotus and Thucydidês, found an array of powerful Doric cities conterminous to each other, and beginning at the Isthmus of Corinth. First came Megara, stretching across the isthmus from sea to sea, and occupying the high and rugged mountain-ridge called Geraneia : next Corinth, with its strong and conspicuous acropolis, and its territory including Mount Oneion as well as the portion of the isthmus at once most level and narrowest, which divided its two harbours called Lechæum and Kenchreæ. Westward of Corinth, along the Corinthian Gulf, stood Sikyôn, with a plain of uncommon fertility, between the two towns : southward of Sikyôn and Corinth were Phlius and Kleonæ, both conterminous, as well as Corinth, with Argos and the Argolic peninsula. The inmost bend of the Argolic Gulf, including a considerable space of flat and marshy ground adjoining to the sea, was possessed by Argos ; the Argolic peninsula was divided by Argos with the Doric cities of Epidaurus and Trœzen, and the Dryopian city of Hermionê, the latter possessing the south-western corner. Proceeding southward along the western coast of the gulf, and passing over the little river called Tanos, the traveller found himself in the dominion of Sparta, which comprised the entire southern region of the peninsula from its eastern to its western sea, where the river Neda flows into the latter. He first passed from Argos across the difficult mountain range called Parnôn (which bounds to the west the southern portion of Argolis), until he found himself in the valley of the river Ænus, which he followed until it joined the Eurotas. In the larger valley of the Eurotas, far removed from the sea, and accessible only through the most impracticable mountain roads

Distribution
of Pelopon-
nesus about
450 B.C.

Continuous
Dorian
states.

lay the five unwall'd, unadorn'd, adjoining villages, which bore collectively the formidable name of Sparta. The whole valley of the Eurotas, from Skiritis and Belemnatis at the border of Arcadia, to the Laconian Gulf—expanding in several parts into fertile plain, especially near to its mouth, where the towns of Gythium and Helos were found—belonged to Sparta; together with the cold and high mountain range to the eastward which projects into the promontory of Malea—and the still loftier chain of Taygetus to the westward, which ends in the promontory of Tænarus. On the other side of Taygetus, on the banks of the river Pamisus, which there flows into the Messenian Gulf, lay the plain of Messênê, the richest land in the peninsula. This plain had once yielded its ample produce to the free Messenian Dorians, resident in the towns of Stenyklêrus and Andania. But in the time of which we speak, the name of Messenians was borne only by a body of brave but homeless exiles, whose restoration to the land of their forefathers overpass'd even the exile's proverbially sanguine hope. Their land was confounded with the western portion of Laconia, which reached in a south-westerly direction down to the extreme point of Cape Akritas, and northward as far as the river Neda.

Throughout his whole journey to the point last-mentioned, from the borders of Bœotia and Megaris, the traveller would only step from one Dorian state into another. Western Peloponnesus. But on crossing from the south to the north bank of the river Neda, at a point near to its mouth, he would find himself out of Doric land altogether: first in the territory called Triphylia—next in that of Pisa or the Pisatid—thirdly in the more spacious and powerful state called Elis; these three comprising the coast-land of Peloponnesus from the mouth of the Neda to that of the Larissus. The Triphylians, distributed into a number of small townships, the largest of which was Lepreon—and the Pisatans, equally destitute of any centralising city—had both, at the period of which we are now speaking, been conquered by their more powerful northern neighbours of Elis, who enjoyed the advantage of a spacious territory united under one government; the middle portion, called the Hollow Elis, being for the most part fertile. The Eleians were a section of Ætolian immigrants into Peloponnesus, but the Pisatans and Triphylians had both been originally independent inhabitants of the peninsula—the latter being affirmed to belong to the same race as the Minyæ

who had occupied the ante-Bœotian Orchomenus : both too bore the ascendancy of Elis with perpetual murmur and occasional resistance.

Crossing the river Larissus, and pursuing the northern coast of Peloponnesus south of the Corinthian Gulf, the traveller would pass into Achaia—a name which designated the narrow strip of level land, and the projecting spurs and declivities, between that gulf and the northernmost mountains of the peninsula—Skollis, Erymanthus, Aroania, Krathis, and the towering eminence called Kyllênê. Achæan cities—twelve in number at least, if not more—divided this long strip of land amongst them, from the mouth of the Larissus and the north-western Cape Araxus on one side, to the western boundary of the Sikyonian territory on the other. According to the accounts of the ancient legends and the belief of Herodotus, this territory had been once occupied by Ionian inhabitants, whom the Achæans had expelled.

In making this journey, the traveller would have finished the circuit of Peloponnesus ; but he would still have left untrodden the great central region, enclosed between the territories just enumerated—approaching nearest to the sea on the borders of Triphylia, but never touching it anywhere. This region was Arcadia, possessed by inhabitants who are uniformly represented as all of one race, and all aboriginal. It was high and bleak, full of wild mountain, rock and forest, and abounding, to a degree unusual even in Greece, with those land-locked basins from whence the water finds only a subterraneous issue. It was distributed among a large number of distinct villages and cities. Many of the village tribes—the Mænalii, Parrhasii, Azanes, &c., occupying the central and the western regions, were numbered among the rudest of the Greeks : but along its eastern frontier there were several Arcadian cities which ranked deservedly among the more civilised Peloponnesians. Tegea, Mantinea, Orchomenus, Stymphalus, Pheneus, possessed the whole eastern frontier of Arcadia from the borders of Laconia to those of Sikyôn and Pellênê in Achaia : Phigaleia at the south-western corner, near the borders of Triphylia, and Heræa on the north bank of the Alpheius, near the place where that river quits Arcadia to enter the Pisatis, were also towns deserving of notice. Towards the north of this cold and thinly-peopled region, near Pheneos, was situated the small town of Nonakris, adjoining to which rose the

hardly accessible crags where the rivulet of Styx¹ flowed down: a point of common feeling for all Arcadians, from the terrific sanction which this water was understood to impart to their oaths.

The distribution of Peloponnesus here sketched, suitable to the Persian invasion and the succeeding half century, may also be said (with some allowances) to be adapted to the whole interval between about B.C. 550-370; from the time of the conquest of Thyreatis by Sparta to the battle of Leuktra. But it is not the earliest distribution which history presents to us. Not presuming to criticise the Homeric map of Peloponnesus, and going back only to 776 B.C., we find this material difference—that Sparta occupies only a very small fraction of the large territory above described as belonging to her. Westward of the summit of Mount Taygetus are found another section of Dorians, independent of Sparta: the Messenian Dorians, whose city is on the hill of Stenyklêrus, near the south-western boundary of Arcadia, and whose possessions cover the fertile plain of Messênê along the river Pamisus to its mouth in the Messenian Gulf: it is to be noted that Messênê was then the name of the plain generally, and that no town so called existed until after the battle of Leuktra. Again, eastward of the valley of the Eurotas, the mountainous region and the western shores of the Argolic Gulf down to Cape Malea are also independent of Sparta; belonging to Argos, or rather to Dorian towns in union with Argos. All the great Dorian towns, from the borders of the Megarid to the eastern frontier of Arcadia, as above enumerated, appear to have existed in 776 B.C.: Achaia was in the same condition, so far as we are able to judge, as well as Arcadia, except in regard to its southern frontier continuous with Sparta, of which more will hereafter be said. In

Difference
between
this distri-
bution and
that of 776
B.C.

¹ Herodot. vi. 74; Pausan. viii. 18, 2. See the description and print of the river Styx and the neighbouring rocks in Fiedler's *Reise durch Griechenland*, vol. i. p. 400.

He describes a scene amidst these rocks, in 1826, when the troops of Ibrahim Pasha were in the Morea, which realizes the fearful pictures of war after the manner of the ancient Gauls or Thracians. A crowd of 5000 Greeks of every age and sex had found shelter in a grassy and bushy spot embosomed amidst these crags,—few of them armed.

They were pursued by 5000 Egyptians and Arabians: a very small resistance, in such ground, would have kept the troops at bay, but the poor men either could not or would not offer it. They were forced to surrender: the youngest and most energetic cast themselves headlong from the rocks and perished: 3000 prisoners were carried away captive, and sold for slaves at Corinth, Patras, and Modon: all those who were unfit for sale were massacred on the spot by the Egyptian troops.

respect to the western portion of Peloponnesus, Elis (properly so called) appears to have embraced the same territory in 776 B.C. as in 550 B.C. : but the Pisatid had been recently conquered, and was yet imperfectly subjected by the Eleians ; while Triphylia seems to have been quite independent of them. Respecting the southwestern promontory of Peloponnesus down to Cape Akritas, we are altogether without positive information : reasons will hereafter be given for believing that it did not at that time form part of the territory of the Messenian Dorians.

Of the different races or people whom Herodotus knew in Peloponnesus, he believed three to be aboriginal—the Arcadians, the Achæans, and the Kynurians. The Achæans, though belonging indigenously to the peninsula, had yet removed from the southern portion of it to the northern, expelling the previous Ionian tenants : this is a part of the legend respecting the Dorian conquest or Return of the Herakleids, and we can neither verify nor contradict it. But neither the Arcadians nor the Kynurians had ever changed their abodes. Of the latter I have not before spoken, because they were never (so far as history knows them) an independent population. They occupied the larger portion¹ of the territory of Argolis, from Orneæ, near the northern² or Phliasian border, to Thyrea and the Thyreatis, on the Laconian border : and though belonging originally (as Herodotus imagines rather than asserts) to the Ionic race—they had been so long subjects of Argos in his time, that almost all evidence of their ante-Dorian condition had vanished.

But the great Dorian states in Peloponnesus—the capital powers in the peninsula—were all originally immigrants, according to the belief not only of Herodotus, but of all the Grecian world : so also were the Ætolians of Elis, the Triphylians, and the Dryopes at Hermionê and Asinê. All these immigrations are so described as to give them a root in the Grecian legendary world : the Triphylians are traced back to Lemnos, as the offspring of the Argonautic heroes,³ and we are

¹ This is the only way of reconciling Herodotus (viii. 73) with Thucydides (iv. 56, and v. 41). The original extent of the Kynurian territory is a point on which neither of them had any means of very correct information ; but there is no occasion to reject the one in

favour of the other.

² Herod. viii. 73. Οἱ δὲ Κυνούριοι, αὐτόχθονες ἔδντες, δοκέουσι μούγοι εἶναι Ἴωνες· ἐκδεδωρλεύνται δὲ, ὑπὸ τε Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χρόνου, ἔδντες Ὀρνειῶν καὶ περλόικοι.

³ Herodot. iv. 145–146.

too uninformed about them to venture upon any historical guesses. But respecting the Dorians, it may perhaps be possible, by examining the first historical situation in which they are presented to us, to offer some conjectures as to the probable circumstances under which they arrived. The legendary narrative of it has already been given in the first chapter of this volume—that great mythical event called the Return of the Children of Hêraklês, by which the first establishment of the Dorians in the promised land of Peloponnesus was explained to the full satisfaction of Grecian faith. One single armament and expedition, acting by the special direction of the Delphian god, and conducted by three brothers, lineal descendants of the principal Achæo-Dorian hero through Hyllus (the eponymus of the principal tribe)—the national heroes of the pre-existing population vanquished and expelled, and the greater part of the peninsula both acquired and partitioned at a stroke—the circumstances of the partition adjusted to the historical relations of Laconia and Messenia—the friendly power of Ætolian Elis, with its Olympic games as the bond of union in Peloponnesus, attached to this event as an appendage in the person of Oxylus—all these particulars compose a narrative well-calculated to impress the retrospective imagination of a Greek. They exhibit an epical fitness and sufficiency which it would be unseasonable to impair by historical criticism.

The Alexandrine chronology sets down a period of 328 years from the Return of the Herakleids to the first Olympiad (1104 B.C.—776 B.C.),—a period measured by the lists of the kings of Sparta, on the trustworthiness of which some remarks have already been offered. Of these 328 years, the first 250, at the least, are altogether barren of facts; and even if we admitted them to be historical, we should have nothing to recount except a succession of royal names. Being unable either to guarantee the entire list, or to discover any valid test for discriminating the historical and the non-historical items, I here enumerate the Lacedæmonian kings as they appear in Mr. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*. There were two joint kings at Sparta, throughout nearly all the historical time of independent Greece, deducing their descent from Hêraklês through Eurysthenes and Proklês, the twin sons of Aristodêmus; the latter being one of those three Herakleid brothers to whom the conquest of the peninsula is ascribed:—

Legendary
account of
the Dorian
immigration.

Alexandrine
chronology
from the
Return of
the Hera-
kleids to the
first Olympiad.

SPARTAN KINGS.

<i>Line of Eurysthenês.</i>		<i>Line of Proklês.</i>	
Eurysthenês	reigned 42 years.	Proklês	reigned 51 years.
Agis	31 "	Sôus	— "
Echestratus	35 "	Eurypôn	— "
Labôtas	37 "	Prytanis	49 "
Doryssus	29 "	Eunomus	45 "
Agésilas	44 "	Charilaus	60 "
Archelaus	60 "	Nikander	38 "
Teleklus	40 "	Theopompus	10 "
Alkamenês	10 "		
328			

Both Theopompus and Alkamenês reigned considerably longer, but the chronologists affirm that the year 776 B.C. (or the first Olympiad) occurred in the tenth year of each of their reigns. It is necessary to add, with regard to this list, that there are some material discrepancies between different authors even as to the names of individual kings, and still more as to the duration of their reigns, as may be seen both in Mr. Clinton's chronology and in Müller's Appendix to the History of the Dorians.¹ The alleged sum total cannot be made to agree with the items without great licence of conjecture. O. Müller observes,² in reference to this Alexandrine chronology, "that our materials only enable us to restore it to its original state, not to verify its correctness." In point of fact they are insufficient even for the former purpose, as the dissensions among learned critics attest.

We have a succession of names, still more barren of facts, in the case of the Dorian sovereigns of Corinth. This city had its own line of Herakleids, descended from Hêraklês, but not through Hyllus. Hippotês, the progenitor of the Corinthian Herakleids, was reported in the legend to have originally joined the Dorian invaders of the Peloponnesus, but to have quitted them in consequence of having slain the prophet Karnus.³

¹ Herodotus omits Sôus between Proklês and Eurypôn, and inserts Polydektês between Prytanis and Eunomus: moreover the accounts of the Lacedæmonians, as he states them, represented Lykurgus the lawgiver as uncle and guardian of Labôtas, of the *Eurysthenid house*,—while Simonidês made him son of Prytanis, and others made him son of Eunomus, of the *Proklid line*: compare Herod. i. 65; viii. 131. Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 2.

Some excellent remarks on this early series of Spartan kings will be found in Sir G. C. Lewis's article in the Philo-

logical Museum, vol. ii. p. 42-48, in a review of Dr. Arnold on the Spartan Constitution.

Compare also Larcher, *Chronologie d'Hérodote*, ch. 13. p. 484-514. He lengthens many of the reigns considerably, in order to suit the earlier epoch which he assigns to the capture of Troy and the Return of the Herakleids.

² History of the Dorians, vol. ii. Appendix. p. 442.

³ This story,—that the heroic ancestor of the great Corinthian Bacchiadæ had slain the holy man Karnus, and had been punished for it by long banish-

The three brothers, when they became masters of the peninsula, sent for Alêtês the son of Hippotês, and placed him in possession of Corinth, over which the chronologists make him begin to reign thirty years after the Herakleid conquest. His successors are thus given:—

Aletes	reigned	38 years.
Ixion	„	38 „
Agelas	„	37 „
Prymnis	„	35 „
Bacchis	„	35 „
Agelas	„	30 „
Eudêmus	„	25 „
Aristomêdês	„	35 „
Agêmôn	„	16 „
Alexander	„	25 „
Telestês	„	12 „
Automenês	„	1 „

327

Such was the celebrity of Bacchis, we are told, that those who succeeded him took the name of Bacchiads in place of Aletiads or Herakleids. One year after the accession of Automenês, the family of the Bacchiads generally, amounting to 200 persons, determined to abolish royalty, to constitute themselves a standing oligarchy, and to elect out of their own number an annual Prytanis. Thus commenced the oligarchy of the Bacchiads, which lasted for ninety years, until it was subverted by Kypselus in 657 B.C.¹ Reckoning the thirty years previous to the beginning of the reign

ment and privation—leads to the conjecture, that the Corinthians did not celebrate the festival of the Karneia, common to the Dorians generally.

Herodotus tells us, with regard to the Ionic cities, that all of them celebrated the festival of Apaturia, except Ephesus and Kolophon; and that these two cities did not celebrate it, “because of a certain reason of murder committed,”—*οὗτοι γὰρ μοῖνοι Ἰώνων οὐκ ἄγουσιν Ἀπατούρια· καὶ οὗτοι κατὰ φόνου τινα σκῆψιν* (Herod. i. 147).

The murder of Karnus by Hippotês was probably the *φόνου σκῆψις* which forbade the Corinthians from celebrating the Karneia; at least this supposition gives to the legend a special pertinence which is otherwise wanting to it. Respecting the Karneia and Hyacinthia see Schoell *De Origine Græci Dramatis*, p. 70–78. Tübingen, 1828.

There were various singular customs connected with the Grecian festivals,

which it was usual to account for by some legendary tale. Thus no native of Elis ever entered himself as a competitor, or contended for the prize, at the Isthmian games. The legendary reason given for this was, that Hêraklês had waylaid and slain (at Kleônæ) the two Molionid brothers, when they were proceeding to the Isthmian games as Theôrs or sacred envoys from the Eleian king Augæus. Redress was in vain demanded for this outrage, and Molionê, mother of the slain envoys, imprecated a curse upon the Eleians generally if they should ever visit the Isthmian festival. This legend is the *φόνου σκῆψις*, explaining why no Eleian runner or wrestler was ever known to contend there (Pausan. ii. 15, 1; v. 2, 1–4. Ister, Fragment. 46; ed. Didot).

¹ Diodor. *Fragm. lib. vii. p. 14*, with the note of Wesseling. Strabo (viii. p. 378) states the Bacchiad oligarchy to have lasted nearly 200 years.

of Alêtês, the chronologists thus provide an interval of 447 years between the Return of the Herakleids and the accession of Kypselus, and 357 years between the same period and the commencement of the Bacchiad oligarchy. The Bacchiad oligarchy is unquestionably historical; the conquest of the Herakleids belongs to the legendary world; while the interval between the two is filled up, as in so many other cases, by a mere barren genealogy.

When we jump this vacant space, and place ourselves at the first opening of history, we find that although ultimately Sparta came to hold the first place, not only in Peloponnesus, but in all Hellas, this was not the case at the earliest moment of which we have historical cognizance. Argos, and the neighbouring towns connected with her by a bond of semi-religious, semi-political union,—Sikyôn, Phlius, Epidaurus, and Trœzên,—were at first of greater power and consideration than Sparta; a fact which the legend of the Herakleids seems to recognise by making Têmenus the eldest brother of the three. And Herodotus assures us that at one time all the eastern coast of Peloponnesus down to Cape Malea, including the island of Kythêra, all which came afterwards to constitute a material part of Laconia, had belonged to Argos.¹ Down to the time of the first Messenian war, the comparative importance of the Dorian establishments in Peloponnesus appears to have been in the order in which the legend placed them,—Argos first,² Sparta second, Messênê third. It will be seen hereafter that the Argeians never lost the recollection of this early pre-eminence, from which the growth of Sparta had extruded them; and the liberty of entire Hellas was more than once in danger from their disastrous jealousy of a more fortunate competitor.

At a short distance of about three miles from Argos, and at the exact point where that city approaches nearest to the sea,³ was situated the isolated hillock called Temenion, noticed both by

¹ Herodot. i. 82. The historian adds, besides Kythêra, *καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν νήσων*. What other islands are meant I do not distinctly understand.

² So Plato (Legg. iii. p. 692), whose mind is full of the old mythe and the tripartite distribution of Peloponnesus among the Herakleids,—*ἡ δ' αὖ, πρωτεύουσα ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις τοῖς περὶ τὴν διανομήν, ἢ περὶ τὸ Ἄργος, &c.*

³ Pausan. ii. 38, 1; Strabo, viii. p. 368. Professor Ross observes respecting the line of coast near Argos, "The sea-

side is thoroughly flat and for the most part marshy: only at the single point where Argos comes nearest to the coast—between the mouth, now choked by sand, of the united Inachus and Charadrus, and the efflux of the Erasinus, overgrown with weeds and bulrushes,—stands an eminence of some elevation and composed of firmer earth, upon which the ancient Temenion was placed." (Reisen im Peloponnes, vol. i. sect. 5. p. 149, Berlin, 1841.)

Strabo and Pausanias. It was a small village deriving both its name and its celebrity from the chapel and tomb of the hero Têmenus, who was there worshipped by the Dorians; and the statement which Pausanias heard was, that Têmenus with his invading Dorians had seized and fortified the spot, and employed it as an armed post to make war upon Tisamenus and the Achæans. What renders this report deserving of the greater attention is, that the same thing is affirmed with regard to the eminence called Solygeius near Corinth: this too was believed to be the place which the Dorian assailants had occupied and fortified against the pre-existing Corinthians in the city. Situated close upon the Sarônîc Gulf, it was the spot which invaders landing from that gulf would naturally seize upon, and which Nikias with his powerful Athenian fleet did actually seize and occupy against Corinth in the Peloponnesian war.¹ In early days the only way of overpowering the inhabitants of a fortified town, generally also planted in a position itself very defensible, was—that the invaders, entrenching themselves in the neighbourhood, harassed the inhabitants and ruined their produce until they brought them to terms. Even during the Peloponnesian war, when the art of besieging had made some progress, we read of several instances in which this mode of aggressive warfare was adopted with efficient results.² We may readily believe that the Dorians obtained admittance both into Argos and Corinth in this manner. And it is remarkable that, except Sikyôn (which is affirmed to have been surprised by night), these were the only towns in the Argolic region which are said to have resisted them; the story being, that Phlius, Epidaurus, and Trœzên had admitted the Dorian intruders without opposition, although a certain portion of the previous inhabitants seceded. We shall hereafter see that the non-Dorian population of Sikyôn and Corinth still remained considerable.

The separate statements which we thus find, and the position of the Temenion and the Solygeius, lead to two conjectures—first, that the acquisitions of the Dorians in Peloponnesus were also isolated and gradual, not at all conformable to the rapid strides of the old Herakleid legend; next, that the Dorian invaders of Argos and Corinth made their attack from the Argolic and the Sarônîc Gulfs—by sea and not by land. It is indeed difficult to see how they can have got to the Temenion

Early settlements of the Dorians at Argos and Corinth —Temenion —Hill of Solygeius.

Dorian settlers arrived by sea.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 42.

² Thucyd. i. 122; iii. 85; vii. 18-27; viii. 38-40.

in any other way than by sea ; and a glance at the map will show that the eminence Solymeus presents itself,¹ with reference to Corinth, as the nearest and most convenient holding-ground for a maritime invader, conformably to the scheme of operations laid by Nikias. To illustrate the supposition of a Dorian attack by sea on Corinth, we may refer to a story quoted from Aristotle (which we find embodied in the explanation of an old adage) representing Hippotês the father of Alêtês as having crossed the Maliac Gulf² (the sea immediately bordering on the ancient Maleans, Dryopians and Dorians) in ships for the purpose of colonising. And if it be safe to trust the mention of Dorians in the Odyssey, as a part of the population of the island of Krete, we there have an example of

Early
Dorians in
Krête.

Dorian settlements which must have been effected by sea, and that too at a very early period. "We must suppose (observes O. Müller,³ in reference to these Kretan Dorians) that the Dorians, pressed by want or restless from inactivity, constructed piratical canoes, manned these frail and narrow barks with soldiers who themselves worked at the oar, and thus being changed from mountaineers into seamen—the Normans of Greece—set sail for the distant island of Krête." In the same manner we may conceive the expeditions of the Dorians against Argos and Corinth to have been effected : and whatever difficulties may attach to this hypothesis, certain it is that the difficulties of a long land march, along such a territory as Greece, are still more serious.

The supposition of Dorian emigrations by sea, from the Maliac Gulf to the north-eastern promontory of Peloponnesus, is farther borne out by the analogy of the Dryopes or Dryopians. During the historical times, this people occupied several detached settlements in various parts of Greece, all maritime and some insular:—they were found at Hermione, Asinê, and Eîôn, in the Argolic peninsula (very near to the important Dorian towns constituting the Amphiktyony of Argos⁴)

¹ Thucyd. iv. 42.

² Aristot. ap. Prov. Vatican. iv. 4, Μηλιακὸν πλοῖον — also Prov. Suidas, x. 2.

³ Hist. of Dorians, ch. i. 9. Andrôn positively affirms that the Dorians came from Histieôtis to Krete; but his affirmation does not seem to me to constitute any additional evidence of the fact: it is a conjecture adapted to the passage in the Odyssey (xix. 174), as the mention of Achæans and Pelasgians evidently shows.

Aristotle (ap. Strab. viii. p. 374) appears to have believed that the Herakleids retired to Argos out of the Attic Tetrapolis (where, according to the Athenian legend, they had obtained shelter when persecuted by Eurys-theus), accompanying a body of Ionians who then settled at Epidaurus. He cannot therefore have connected the Dorian occupation of Argos with the expedition from Naupaktus.

⁴ Herod. viii. 43-46; Diodor. iv. 37; Pausan. iv. 34, 6.

—at Styra and Karystus in the island of Eubœa—in the island of Kythnus, and even at Cyprus. These dispersed colonies can only have been planted by expeditions over the sea. Now we are told that the original Dryopis, the native country of this people, comprehended both the territory near the river Spercheius, and north of Cæta, afterwards occupied by the Malians, as well as the neighbouring district south of Cæta, which was afterwards called Doris. From hence the Dryopians were expelled—according to one story, by the Dorians—according to another, by Hêraklês and the Malians: however this may be, it was from the Maliac Gulf that they started on shipboard in quest of new homes, which some of them found on the headlands of the Argolic peninsula.¹ And it was from this very country, according to Herodotus,² that the Dorians also set forth, in order to reach Peloponnesus. Nor does it seem unreasonable to imagine, that the same means of conveyance, which bore the Dryopians from the Maliac Gulf to Hermionê and Asinê, also carried the Dorians from the same place to the Temenion and the hill Solygeius.

The legend represents Sikyon, Epidaurus, Trœzên, Phlius, and Kleônæ, as all occupied by Dorian colonists from Argos, under the different sons of Têmenus: the first three are on the sea, and fit places for the occupation of maritime invaders. Argos and the Dorian towns in and near the Argolic peninsula are to be regarded as a cluster of settlements by themselves, completely distinct from Sparta and the Messenian Stenyklêrus, which appear to have been formed under totally different conditions. First, both of them are very far inland—Stenyklêrus not easy, Sparta very difficult of access from the sea; next, we know that the conquests of Sparta were gradually made down the valley of the Eurotas seaward. Both these acquisitions present the appearance of having been made from the land-side, and perhaps in the direction which the Herakleid legend describes—by warriors entering Peloponnesus across the narrow mouth of the Corinthian Gulf, through the aid or invitation of those Ætolian settlers who at the same time colonised Elis. The early and intimate connexion (on which I shall touch presently) between Sparta and the Olympic games as administered by the Eleians, as well as the leading part ascribed to Lykurgus in the

Dorian settlements in Argos quite distinct from those in Sparta and in Messenia.

¹ Strabo, viii. p. 373; ix. p. 434. Herodot. viii. 43. Pherekydês, Fr. 23 and 38, ed. Didot. Steph. Byz. v. Δρυόπη. Apollodor. ii. 7, 7. Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 1213.

² Herodot. i. 56.—ἐνθεῦτεν δὲ αὐτὶς ἐς τὴν Δρυοπόδα μετέβη, καὶ ἐκ τῆς Δρυοπίδος οὕτως ἐς Πελοπόννησον ἔλθον, Δωρικὸν ἐκλήθη—to the same purpose, viii. 31–43.

constitution of the solemn Olympic truce, tend to strengthen such a persuasion.

How Sparta came constantly to gain upon Argos will be matter for future explanation:¹ at present it is sufficient to remark, that the ascendancy of Argos was derived not exclusively from her own territory, but came in part from her position as metropolis of an alliance of autonomous neighbouring cities, all Dorian and all colonised from herself—and this was an element of power essentially fluctuating. What Thêbes was to the cities of Bœotia, of which she either was, or professed to have been, the founder²—the same was Argos in reference to Kleônæ, Phlius, Sikyôn, Epidaurus, Trœzên, and Ægina. These towns formed, in mythical language, “the lot of Têmenus,”³—in real matter of fact the confederated allies or subordinates of Argos: the first four of them were said to have been *dorised* by the sons or immediate relatives of Têmenus, and the kings of Argos, as acknowledged descendants of the latter, claimed and exercised a sort of *suzeraineté* over them. Hermionê, Asinê, and Nauplia seem also to have been under the supremacy of Argos, though not colonies.⁴ But this supremacy was not claimed directly and nakedly: agreeably to the ideas of the time, the ostensible purposes of the Argeian confederacy or Amphiktyony were religious, though its secondary, and not less real effects, were political. The great patron-god of the league was Apollo Pythaëus, in whose name the obligations incumbent on the

¹ See Herodot. vii. 148. The Argeians say to the Lacedæmonians, in reference to the chief command of the Greeks—καίτοι κατὰ γε τὸ δίκαιον γίνεσθαι τὴν ἡγεμονίην ἐώντων, &c. Schweighauser and others explain the point by reference to the command of Agamemnôn; but this is at best only a part of the foundation of their claim: they had a more recent historical reality to plead also: compare Strabo, viii. p. 376.

² Ἡμῶν κτισάντων (so runs the accusation of the Theban orators against the captive Platæans, before their Lacedæmonian judges, Thucyd. iii. 61.) Πλάταιαν ὕστερον τῆς ἄλλης Βοιωτίας—οὐκ ἤξιουν αὐτοί, ὥσπερ ἐτάχθη τὸ πρῶτον, ἡγεμονεῦσθαι ὑφ’ ἡμῶν, ἔξω δὲ τῶν ἄλλων Βοιωτῶν παραβαίοντες τὰ πατρία, ἐπειδὴ προσηναγκάζοντο, προσεχώρησαν πρὸς Ἀθηναίους καὶ μετ’ αὐτῶν πολλὰ ἡμῶς ἐβλαπτον.

³ Respecting Pheidôn, king of Argos, Ephorus said—τὴν λῆξιν ὅλην ἀνέλαβε

τὴν Τημένου διεσπασμένην εἰς πλείω μέρη (ap. Strabo. viii. p. 358).

⁴ The worship of Apollo Pythaëus, adopted from Argos both at Hermionê and Asinê, shows the connexion between them and Argos (Pausan. ii. 35, 2; ii. 36, 5): but Pausanias can hardly be justified in saying that the Argeians actually *dorised* Hermionê; it was Dryopian in the time of Herodotus, and seemingly for a long time afterwards (Herodot. viii. 45). The Hermionian Inscription, No. 1193, in Boeckh’s Collection, recognises their old Dryopian connexion with Asinê in Laconia: that town had once been neighbour of Hermionê, but was destroyed by the Argeians, and the inhabitants received a new home from the Spartans. The dialect of the Hermionians (probably that of the Dryopians generally) was Doric. See Ahrens, De Dialecto Doricâ, p. 2-12.

members of the league were imposed. While in each of the confederated cities there was a temple to this god, his most holy and central sanctuary was on the Larissa or acropolis of Argos. At this central Argeian sanctuary solemn sacrifices were offered by Epidaurus as well as by other members of the confederacy, and as it should seem, accompanied by money-payments¹—which the Argeians, as chief administrators on behalf of the common god, took upon them to enforce against defaulters, and actually tried to enforce during the Peloponnesian war against Epidaurus. On another occasion, during the 66th Olympiad (B.C. 514), they imposed the large fine of 500 talents upon each of the two states Sikyôn and Ægina, for having lent ships to the Spartan king Kleomenes wherewith he invaded the Argeian territory. The Æginetans set the claim at defiance, but the Sikyonians acknowledged its justice, and only demurred to its amount, professing themselves ready to pay 100 talents.² There can be no doubt that at this later period the ascendancy of Argos over the members of her primitive confederacy had become practically inoperative; but the tenor of the cases mentioned shows that her claims were revivals of bygone privileges, which had once been effective and valuable.

How valuable the privileges of Argos were, before the great rise of the Spartan power,—how important an ascendancy they conferred in the hands of an energetic man, and how easily they admitted of being used in furtherance of ambitious views,—is shown by the remarkable case of Pheidôn the Temenid. The few facts which we learn respecting this prince exhibit to us, for the first time, something like a real position of parties in the Peloponnesus, wherein the actual conflict of living, historical men and cities comes out in tolerable distinctness.

Pheidôn the
Temenid—
king of
Argos.

Pheidôn was designated by Ephorus as the tenth, and by Theopompus as the sixth, in lineal descent from Têmenus. Respecting the date of his existence, opinions the most discrepant and irreconcilable have been delivered; but there seems good reason for referring him to the period a little before and a little

¹ Thucyd. v. 53. Κυριώτατοι τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἦσαν οἱ Ἀργεῖοι. The word εἰσπραξις, which the historian uses in regard to the claim of Argos against Epidaurus, seems to imply a money-payment withheld: compare the offerings exacted by Athens from Epidaurus (Herod. v. 82).

The peculiar and intimate connexion between the Argeians, and Apollo with his surname of Pythæus, was dwelt upon by the Argeian poetess Telesilla (Pausan. ii. 36, 2).

² Herodot. vi. 92. See O. Müller, History of the Dorians, ch. 7. 13.

after the 8th Olympiad,—between 770 B.C. and 730 B.C.¹ Of the preceding kings of Argos we hear little; one of them, Eratus, is said to have expelled the Dryopian inhabitants of Asinê from their town on the Argolic peninsula, in consequence of their having co-operated with the Spartan king Nikander when he invaded the Argeian territory, seemingly during the generation preceding Pheidôn; there is another, Damokratidas, whose date cannot be positively determined, but he appears rather as subsequent than as anterior to Pheidôn.² We are informed however that these anterior kings, even beginning with Medôn, the grandson of Têmenus, had been forced to submit to great abridgement of their power and privileges, and that a form of government substantially popular, though nominally regal, had been established.³ Pheidôn, breaking though the limits imposed, made himself despot of Argos. He then re-established the power of Argos over all the cities of her confederacy, which had before been so nearly dissolved as to leave all the members practically independent.⁴ Next, he is said to have acquired dominion over Corinth, and to have endeavoured to assure it by treacherously entrapping 1000 of her warlike citizens: but his artifice was

¹ Ephor. Fragm. 15, ed. Marx; ap. Strabo, viii. p. 358; Theopompus, Fragm. 30, ed. Didot; ap. Diodor. Fragm. lib. iv.

The Parian Marble makes Pheidôn the eleventh from Hêrâklês and places him B.C. 895; Herodotus, on the contrary (in a passage which affords considerable grounds for discussion), places him at a period which cannot be much higher than 600 B.C. (vi. 127). Some authors suspect the text of Herodotus to be incorrect: at any rate, the real epoch of Pheidôn is determined by the eighth Olympiad. Several critics suppose *two* Pheidôns, each king of Argos—among others, O. Müller (Dorians, iii. 6, 10); but there is nothing to countenance this except the impossibility of reconciling Herodotus with the other authorities. And Weissenborn, in a dissertation of some length, vindicates the emendation of Pausanias proposed by some former critics,—altering the eighth Olympiad, which now stands in the text of Pausanias, into the *twenty-eighth*, as the date of Pheidôn's usurpation at the Olympic games. Weissenborn endeavours to show that Pheidôn cannot have flourished earlier than 660 B.C.: but his arguments do not appear to me very forcible, and certainly not sufficient to justify so

grave an alteration in the number of Pausanias (Beiträge zur Griechischen Alterthumskunde, p. 18, Jena, 1844). Mr. Clinton (Fasti Hellenici, vol. i. App. 1. p. 249) places Pheidôn between 783 and 744 B.C.; also Boeckh. ad Corp. Inscript. No. 2374, p. 335, and Müller, Æginetica, p. 63.

² Pausan. ii. 36, 5; iv. 35, 2.

³ Pausan. ii. 19, 1. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ, ἅτε ἰσηγορίαν καὶ τὸ αὐτόνομον ἀγαπῶντες ἐκ παλαιστάτου, τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῶν βασιλέων ἐς ἐλάχιστον προήγαγον, ὡς Μῆδωνι τῷ Κεῖσου καὶ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις τὸ ὄνομα λειφθῆναι τοῦ βασιλέως μόνον. This passage has all the air of transferring back to the *early* government of Argos feelings which were only true of the *later*. It is curious, that in this chapter, though devoted to the Argeian regal line and government, Pausanias takes no notice of Pheidôn: he mentions him only with reference to the disputed Olympic ceremony.

⁴ Ephorus, *ut supra*. Φεῖδωνα τὸν Ἀργεῖον, δέκατον ὄντα ἀπὸ Τημένου, δυνάμει δὲ ὑπερβεβλημένον τοὺς κατ' αὐτὸν, ἀφ' ἧς τὴν τε λῆξιν ὅλην ἀνέλαβε τὴν Τημένον διεσπασμένην εἰς πλείω μέρη, &c. What is meant by the *lot* of Têmenus has been already explained.

divulged and frustrated by Abrôn, one of his confidential friends.¹ He is farther reported to have aimed at extending his sway over the greater part of Peloponnesus,—laying claim, as the descendant of Hêrâklês through the eldest son of Hyllus, to all the cities which that restless and irresistible hero had ever taken.² According to Grecian ideas, this legendary title was always seriously construed and often admitted as conclusive; though of course, where there were strong opposing interests, reasons would be found to elude it. Pheidôn would have the same ground of right as that which, 250 years afterwards, determined the Herakleid Dôrieus, brother of Kleomenês king of Sparta, to acquire for himself the territory near Mount Eryx in Sicily, because his progenitor³ Hêrâklês had conquered it before him. So numerous however were the legends respecting the conquests of Hêrâklês, that the claim of Pheidôn must have covered the greater part of Peloponnesus, except Sparta and the plain of Messêne, which were already in the hands of Herakleids.

His claims and projects as representative of Hêrâklês.

Nor was the ambition of Pheidôn satisfied even with these large pretensions. He farther claimed the right of presiding at the celebration of those religious games or Agônes which had been instituted by Hêrâklês,—and amongst these was numbered the Olympic Agôn, then, however, enjoying but a slender fraction of the lustre which afterwards came to attach to it. The presidency of any of the more celebrated festivals current throughout Greece was a privilege immensely prized. It was at once dignified and lucrative, and the course of our history will present more than one example in which blood was shed to determine what state should enjoy it. Pheidôn marched to Olympia, at the epoch of the 8th recorded Olympiad, or 747 B.C.; on the occasion of which event we are made acquainted with the real state of parties in the peninsula.

He claims the right of presiding at the Olympic games.

The plain of Olympia—now ennobled only by immortal recollections, but once crowded with all the decorations of religion and art, and forming for many centuries the brightest centre of attraction known in the ancient world—was

Relations of Pisa with Pheidôn, and of Sparta with Elis.

¹ Plutarch, Narrat. Amator. p. 772; Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iv. 1212; compare Didymus, ap. Schol. Pindar. Olymp. xiii. 27.

I cannot, however, believe that Pheidôn, the ancient Corinthian lawgiver mentioned by Aristotle, is the same person as Pheidôn the king of Argos

(Polit. ii. 6, 4).

² Ephor. *ut supra*. Πρὸς τοῦτοις, ἐπιθέσθαι καὶ ταῖς ὑφ' Ἡρακλέους αἰρεθείσας πόλεσι, καὶ τοῦς ἀγῶνας ἀξιούν τιθέναι αὐτὸν, οὗς ἐκεῖνος ἔθηκε· τούτων δὲ εἶναι καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπιακὸν, &c.

³ Herodot. v. 43.

situated on the river Alpheius in the territory called the Pisatid, hard by the borders of Arcadia. At what time its agonistic festival, recurring every fourth year at the first full moon after the summer solstice, first began or first acquired its character of special sanctity, we have no means of determining. As with so many of the native waters of Greece—we follow the stream upward to a certain point, but the fountain-head and the earlier flow of history are buried under mountains of unsearchable legend. The first celebration of the Olympic contests was ascribed by Grecian legendary faith to Hêraklês—and the site of the place, in the middle of the Pisatid with its eight small townships, is quite sufficient to prove that the inhabitants of that little territory were warranted in describing themselves as the original administrators of the ceremony.¹ But this state of things seems to have been altered by the Ætolian settlement in Elis, which is represented as having been conducted by Oxylus and identified with the Return of the Herakleids. The Ætolo-Eleians, bordering upon the Pisatid to the north, employed their superior power in subduing their weaker neighbours,² who thus lost their autonomy and became annexed to the territory of Elis. It was the general rule throughout Greece, that a victorious state undertook to perform³ the current services of the conquered people towards the gods—such services being conceived as attaching to the soil. Hence the celebration of the Olympic games became numbered among the incumbencies of Elis, just in the same way as the worship of the Eleusinian Dêmêtêr, when Eleusis lost its autonomy, was included among the religious obligations of Athens. The Pisatans however never willingly acquiesced in this absorption of what had once been their separate privilege. They long maintained their conviction that the celebration of the games was their right, and strove on several occasions to regain it. Of those occasions the earliest, so far as we hear, was connected with the intervention of Pheidôn. It was at their invitation that the king of Argos went to Olympia, and celebrated the games himself, in conjunction with the Pisatans, as the lineal successor of Hêraklês; while the Elcians, being thus forcibly dispossessed, refused to include the 8th Olympiad in their register of the victorious runners. But their humiliation did not last long, for the Spartans took their part, and the contest ended in the defeat of Pheidôn. In the next Olympiad, the Eleian management and the regular enrolment appear as before.

Conflict between
Pheidôn and
the Spartans,
at or about
the 8th
Olympiad,
748 B.C. †

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. vii. 4, 28; Diodor. | xv. 78.

² Strabo, viii. p. 354.

³ Thucyd. iv. 98.

The Spartans are even said to have confirmed Elis in her possession both of Pisatis and Triphylia.¹

Unfortunately these scanty particulars are all which we learn respecting the armed conflict at the 8th Olympiad, in which the religious and the political grounds of quarrel are so intimately blended—as we shall find to be often the case in Grecian history. But there is one act of Pheidôn yet more memorable, of which also nothing beyond a meagre notice has come down to us. He first coined both copper and silver money in Ægina, and first established a scale of weights and measures,² which, through his influence, became adopted throughout Peloponnesus, and acquired ultimately footing both in all the Dorian states, and in Bœotia, Thessaly, northern Hellas generally, and Macedonia—under the name of the Æginæan scale. There arose subsequently another rival scale in Greece, called the Euboic, differing considerably from the Æginæan. We do not know at what time the Euboic came in, but it was employed both at Athens and in the Ionic cities generally, as well as in Eubœa—being modified at Athens, so far as money was concerned, by Solôn's debasement of the coinage.

Pheidôn
the earliest
Greek who
coined
money and
determined
a scale of
weight.

The copious and valuable information contained in M. Boeckh's recent publication on Metrology has thrown new light upon these monetary and statical scales.³ He has shown that both the Æginæan and the Euboic scales—the former standing to the latter in the proportion of 6 : 5—had contemporaneous currency in different parts of the Persian empire; the divisions and denominations of the scale being the same in both, 100 drachmæ to a mina, and 60 minæ to a talent. The Babylonian talent, mina, and drachma are identical with the Æginæan: the word mina is of Asiatic origin; and it has now been rendered highly probable, that the scale circulated by Phei-

Coincidence
of the Ægi-
næan scale
with the
Babylonian.

¹ Pausan. v. 22, 2; Strabo, viii. p. 354–358; Herodot. vi. 127. The name of the victor (Antiklès the Messenian), however, belonging to the 8th Olympiad, appears duly in the lists; it must have been supplied afterwards.

² Herodot. vi. 127; Ephor. ap. Strab. viii. p. 358–376.

³ Metrologische Untersuchungen über Gewichte, Münzfusse, und Masse des Alterthums in ihrem Zusammenhange dargestellt, von Aug. Boeckh; Berlin, 1838.

See chap. 7, 1–3. But I cannot agree with M. Boeckh in thinking that Phei-

dôn, in celebrating the Olympic games, deduced from the Olympic stadium, and formally adopted, the measure of the foot, or that he at all settled measures of length. In general, I do not think that M. Boeckh's conclusions are well made out, in respect to the Grecian measures of length and capacity. In an examination of this eminently learned treatise (inserted in the Classical Museum, 1844, vol. i.) I endeavoured to set forth both the new and interesting points established by the author, and the various others in which he appeared to me to have erred.

dôn was borrowed immediately from the Phœnicians, and by them originally from the Babylonians. The Babylonian, Hebraic, Phœnician, Egyptian, and Grecian scales of weight (which were subsequently followed wherever coined money was introduced) are found to be so nearly conformable, as to warrant a belief that they are all deduced from one common origin; and that origin the Chaldæan priesthood of Babylon. It is to Pheidôn, and to his position as chief of the Argeian confederacy, that the Greeks owe the first introduction of the Babylonian scale of weight, and the first employment of coined and stamped money.

If we maturely weigh the few, but striking acts of Pheidôn which have been preserved to us, and which there is no reason to discredit, we shall find ourselves introduced to an early historical state of Peloponnesus very different from that to which another century will bring us. That Argos, with the federative cities attached to her, was at this early time decidedly the commanding power in that peninsula, is sufficiently shown by the establishment and reception of the Pheidonian weights, measures, and monetary system—while the other incidents mentioned completely harmonise with the same idea. Against the oppressions of Elis, the Pisatans invoked Pheidôn—partly as exercising a primacy in Peloponnesus, just as the inhabitants of Lepreum in Triphylia,¹ three centuries afterwards, called in the aid of Sparta for the same object, at a time when Sparta possessed the headship—and partly as the lineal representative of Hêrâklês, who had founded those games from the management of which they had been unjustly extruded. On the other hand, Sparta appears as a second-rate power. The Æginæan scale of weight and measure was adopted there as elsewhere²—the Messenian Dorians were still equal and independent—and we find Sparta interfering to assist Elis by virtue of an obligation growing (so the legend represents it) out of the common Ætolo-Dorian immigration: not at all from any acknowledged primacy, such as we shall see her enjoying hereafter. The first coinage of copper and silver money is a capital event in Grecian history, and must be held to imply considerable commerce as well as those extensive views which belong only to a conspicuous and leading position. The ambition of Pheidôn to resume all the acquisitions made by his ancestor Hêrâklês, suggests

¹ Thucyd. v. 31.

² Plutarch, Apophthegm. Laconic. p. 226; Dikæarchus ap. Athenæ. iv. p. 141.

The Æginæan mina, drachma and obolus were the denominations employed in stipulations among the Peloponnesian states (Thucyd. v. 47).

the same large estimate of his actual power. He is characterised as a despot, and even as the most insolent of all despots :¹ how far he deserved such a reputation, we have no means of judging. We may remark, however, that he lived before the age of despots or tyrants, properly so called, and before the Herakleid lineage had yet lost its primary, half-political, half-religious character. Moreover, the later historians have invested his actions with a colour of exorbitant aggression, by applying them to a state of things which belonged to their time, and not to his. Thus Ephorus represents him as having deprived the Lacedæmonians of the headship of Peloponnesus, which they never possessed until long after him—and also as setting at nought the sworn inviolability of the territory of the Eleians, enjoyed by the latter as celebrators of the Olympic games ; whereas the Agonothesia, or right of superintendence claimed by Elis, had not at that time acquired the sanction of prescription—while the conquest of Pisa by the Eleians themselves had proved that this sacred function did not protect the territory of a weaker people.

How Pheidôn fell, and how the Argeians lost that supremacy which they once evidently possessed, we have no positive details to inform us: with respect to the latter point, however, we can discern a sufficient explanation. The Argeians stood predominant as an entire and unanimous confederacy, which required a vigorous and able hand to render its internal organisation effective or its ascendancy respected without. No such leader afterwards appeared at Argos, the whole history of which city is destitute of eminent individuals : her line of kings continued at least down to the Persian war,² but seemingly with only titular functions, for the government had long been decidedly popular. The statements, which represent the government as popular anterior to the time of Pheidôn, appear unworthy of trust. That prince is rather to be taken as wielding the old, undiminished prerogatives of the Herakleid kings, but wielding them with unusual effect—enforcing relaxed privileges, and appealing to the old heroic sentiment in reference to Hêraklês, rather than revolutionising the existing relations either of Argos or of Peloponnesus. It was in fact the great and steady growth of Sparta, for three centuries after the Lykurgæan institutions, which operated as a cause of subversion to the previous order of command and obedience in Greece.

¹ Herodot. vi. 127. Φείδωνος τοῦ Ἀργείων τυράννου—τοῦ ὑβρίσαντος μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων. Pausanias (vi. 22, 2) copies the expression.

Aristotle cites Pheidôn as a person who, being a βασιλεὺς, made himself a τύραννος (Politic. viii. 8, 5).

² Herodot. vii. 149.

The assertion made by Herodotus—that in earlier times the whole eastern coast of Laconia, as far as Cape Malea, including the island of Kythêra and several other islands, had belonged to Argos—is referred by O. Müller to about the 50th Olympiad, or 580 B.C. Perhaps it had ceased to be true at that period; but that it was true in the age of Pheidôn, there seem good grounds for believing. What is probably meant is, that the Dorian towns on this coast, Prasiæ, Zarêx, Epidaurus Limêra, and Bœæ, were once autonomous, and members of the Argeian confederacy—a fact highly probable, on independent evidence, with respect to Epidaurus Limêra, inasmuch as that town was a settlement from Epidaurus in the Argolic peninsula: and Bœæ too had its own *œkist* and eponymus, the Herakleid Bœus,¹ noway connected with Sparta—perhaps derived from the same source as the name of the town Bœon in Doris. The Argeian confederated towns would thus comprehend the whole coast of the Argolic and Saronic gulfs, from Kythêra as far as Ægina, besides other islands which we do not know: Ægina had received a colony of Dorians from Argos and Epidaurus, upon which latter town it continued for some time in a state of dependence.² It will at once be seen that this extent of coast implies a considerable degree of commerce and maritime activity. We have besides to consider the range of Doric colonies in the southern islands of the Ægean and in the south-western corner of Asia Minor—Krête, Kôs, Rhodes (with its three distinct cities), Halikarnassus, Knidus, Myndus, Nisyros, Symê, Karpathus, Kalydna, &c. Of the Doric establishments here named, several are connected (as has been before stated) with the great emigration of the Têmenid Althæmenês from Argos: but what we particularly observe is, that they are often referred as colonies promiscuously to Argos, Trœzen, Epidaurus³—more frequently however, as it seems, to Argos. All these settlements are doubtless older than Pheidôn,

¹ Pausan. iii. 22, 9; iii. 23, 4.

² Herodot. v. 83; Strabo, viii. p. 375.

³ Rhodes, Kôs, Knidus, and Halikarnassus are all treated by Strabo (xiv. p. 653) as colonies of Argos: Rhodes is so described by Thucydides (vii. 57), and Kôs by Tacitus (xii. 61). Kôs, Kalydna, and Nisyros are described by Herodotus as colonies of Epidaurus (vii. 99): Halikarnassus passes sometimes for a colony of Trœzen, sometimes of Trœzen and Argos conjointly:—"Cum Melas et Areuanius ab Argis et Trœzene coloni-

am communem eo loco induxerunt, barbaros Caras et Leleges ejecerunt (Vitruv. ii. 8, 12; Steph. Byz. v. 'Αλικάρνασσος')." Compare Strabo x. p. 479; Conon, Narr. 47; Diodor. v. 80.

Raoul Rochette (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, t. iii. ch. 9) and O. Müller (History of the Dorians, ch. 6) have collected the facts about these Asiatic Dorians.

The little town of Bœæ had its counterpart of the same name in Krête (Steph. Byz. v. Βοίων).

and we may conceive them as proceeding conjointly from the allied Dorian towns in the Argolic peninsula, at a time when they were more in the habit of united action than they afterwards became: a captain of emigrants selected from the line of Hêraklês and Têmenus was suitable to the feelings of all of them. We may thus look back to a period, at the very beginning of the Olympiads, when the maritime Dorians on the east of Peloponnesus maintained a considerable intercourse and commerce not only among themselves, but also with their settlements on the Asiatic coast and islands. That the Argolic peninsula formed an early centre for maritime rendezvous, we may farther infer from the very ancient Amphiktyony of the seven cities (Hermionê, Epidaurus, Ægina, Athens, Prasiæ, Nauplia, and the Minyeian Orchomenus), on the holy island of Kalauria, off the harbour of Trœzên.¹

The view here given of the early ascendancy of Argos, as the head of the Peloponnesian Dorians and the metropolis of the Asiatic Dorians, enables us to understand the capital innovation of Pheidôn—the first coinage, and the first determinate scale of weight and measure known in Greece. Of the value of such improvements, in the history of Grecian civilization, it is superfluous to speak, especially when we recollect that the Hellenic states, having no political unity, were only held together by the aggregate of spontaneous uniformities, in language, religion, sympathies, recreations, and general habits. We see both how Pheidôn came to contract the wish, and how he acquired the power, to introduce throughout so much of the Grecian world a uniform scale. We also see that the Asiatic Dorians form the link between him and Phœnicia, from whence the scale was derived, just as the Euboic scale came in all probability, through the Ionic cities in Asia, from Lydia. It is asserted by Ephorus, and admitted even by the ablest modern critics, that Pheidôn first coined money “in Ægina:”² other authors (erroneously believing that his scale was the Euboic scale) alleged that his coinage had been carried on “in a place of Argos called Eubœa.”³ Now both these statements appear highly improbable, and both are traceable to the same mistake—of supposing that the title, by which the scale had come to be commonly known, must necessarily be derived from the place in which the coinage had been struck. There is every reason to conclude, that what Pheidôn did was

From hence
arose the
coinage of
money, &c.,
by Pheidôn.

¹ Strabo, p. 374.

² Ephorus ap. Strabo. viii. p. 376;
Boeckh, *Metrologie*, Abschn. 7, 1: see

also the *Marmor Parium*, Epoch 30.

³ *Etymologicum Magn.* Εὐβοϊκὸν νόμισμα.

done in Argos, and nowhere else: his coinage and scale were the earliest known in Greece, and seem to have been known by his own name, "the Pheidonian measures," under which designation they were described by Aristotle in his account of the constitution of Argos.¹ They probably did not come to bear the specific epithet of *Æginæan* until there was another scale in vogue, the *Euhoic*, from which to distinguish them; and both the epithets were probably derived, not from the place where the scale first originated, but from the people whose commercial activity tended to make them most generally known—in the one case, the *Æginetans*; in the other case the inhabitants of Chalkis and Eretria. I think, therefore, that we are to look upon the Pheidonian measures as emanating from Argos, and as having no greater connexion, originally, with *Ægina*, than with any other city dependent upon Argos.

There is moreover another point which deserves notice. What was known by the name of the *Æginæan* scale, as contrasted with and standing in a definite ratio (6 : 5) with the *Euhoic* scale, related only to weight and money, so far as our knowledge extends:² we have no evidence to show that the same ratio extended either to measures of length or measures of capacity. But there seems ground for believing that the Pheidonian regulations, taken in their full comprehension, embraced measures of capacity as well as weights: Pheidôn, at the same time when he determined the talent, mina, and drachm, seems also to have fixed the dry and liquid measures—the medimnus and metrêtês, with their parts and multiples: and there existed³ Pheidonian measures of capacity, though not of length, so far as we know. The *Æginæan* scale may thus have comprised only a portion of what was established by Pheidôn, namely that which related to weight and money.

¹ Pollux, *Onomastic*. x. 179. Εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ Φεῖδων τι ἀγγεῖον ἐλαιηρὸν, ἀπὸ τῶν Φεῖδωνίων μέτρων ὀνομασμένον, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐν Ἀργείῳ πολιτεία Ἀριστοτέλης λέγει.

Also Ephorus ap. Strab. viii. p. 353. καὶ μέτρα ἐξεῦρε τὰ Φεῖδωνεῖα καλούμενα

καὶ σταθμοὺς, καὶ νόμισμα κεχαράγμενον, &c.

² This differs from Boeckh's opinion: see the note in page 93.

³ Theophrast. *Character*. c. 13; Pollux. x. 179.

CHAPTER V.

ÆTOLO-DORIAN IMMIGRATION INTO PELOPONNESUS—
ELIS, LACONIA, AND MESSE니아.

It has already been stated that the territory properly called Elis, apart from the enlargement which it acquired by conquest, included the westernmost land in Peloponnesus, south of Achaia, and west of Mount Pholoë and Olenus in Arcadia—but not extending so far southward as the river Alpheius, the course of which lay along the southern portion of Pisatis and on the borders of Triphylia. This territory, which appears in the *Odyssey* as “the divine Elis, where the Epeians hold sway,”¹ is in the historical times occupied by a population of Ætolian origin. The connexion of race between the historical Eleians and the historical Ætolians was recognised by both parties, nor is there any ground for disputing it.²

That Ætolian invaders or immigrants into Elis would cross from Naupaktus or some neighbouring point in the Corinthian Gulf, is in the natural course of things—and such is the course which Oxylus, the conductor of the invasion, is represented by the Herakleid legend as taking. That legend (as has been already recounted) introduces Oxylus as the guide of the three Herakleid brothers—Temenus, Kresphontês, and Aristodêmus—and as stipulating with them that in the new distribution about to take place of Peloponnesus, he shall be allowed to possess the Eleian territory, coupled with many holy privileges as to the celebration of the Olympic games.

In the preceding chapter, I have endeavoured to show that the settlements of the Dorians in and near the Argolic peninsula, so far as the probabilities of the case enable us to judge, were not accomplished by any inroad in this direction. But the localities occupied by the Dorians of Sparta, and by the Dorians of Stenyklêrus in the territory called Messênê, lead us to a different conclusion. The easiest and most natural road through which immi-

¹ *Odys.* xv. 297.² Strabo, x. p. 479.

grants could reach either of these two spots, is through the Eleian and the Pisatid country. Colonel Leake observes¹ that the direct road from the Eleian territory to Sparta, ascending the valley of the Alpheius near Olympia to the sources of its branch the Theius, and from thence descending the Eurotas, affords the only easy march towards that very inaccessible city: and both ancients and moderns have remarked the vicinity of the source of the Alpheius to that of the Eurotas. The situation of Stenyklêrus and Andania, the original settlements of the Messenian Dorians, adjoining closely the Arcadian Parrhasii, is only at a short distance from the

Dorians of Sparta and Stenyklêrus — accompanying or following them across the Corinthian Gulf.

Settlement at Sparta made by marching along the valleys of the Alpheius and Eurotas.

course of the Alpheius; being thus reached most easily by the same route. Dismissing the idea of a great collective Dorian armament, powerful enough to grasp at once the entire peninsula,—we may conceive two moderate detachments of hardy mountaineers from the cold regions in and near Doris, attaching themselves to the Ætolians their neighbours, who were proceeding to the invasion of Elis. After having aided the Ætolians both to occupy Elis and to subdue the Pisatid, these Dorians advanced up the valley of the Alpheius in quest of settlements for themselves. One of these bodies ripens into the stately, stubborn, and victorious Spartans; the other into the short-lived, trampled, and struggling Messenians.

Amidst the darkness which overclouds these original settlements, we seem to discern something like special causes to determine both of them. With respect to the Spartan Dorians, we are told that a person named Philonomus betrayed Sparta to them, persuading the sovereign in possession to retire with his people into the habitations of the Ionians in the north of the peninsula—and that he received as a recompense for this acceptable service Amyklæ with the district around it. It is farther stated—and this important fact there seems no reason to doubt—that Amyklæ, though only twenty stadia or two miles and a half distant from Sparta, retained both its independence and its Achæan inhabitants long after the Dorian immigrants had acquired possession of the latter place, and was only taken by them under the reign of Têleklos, one generation before the first Olympiad.² Without presuming to fill up by con-

¹ Leake, *Travels in Morea*, vol. iii. ch. 23, p. 29; compare Diodor. xv. 66.

The distance from Olympia to Sparta, as marked on a pillar which Pausanias saw at Olympia, was 660 stadia,—about

77 English miles (Pausan. vi. 16, 6).

² Strabo, viii. pp. 364, 365; Pausan. iii. 2, 5; compare the story of Krius, Pausan. iii. 13, 3.

jecture incurable gaps in the statements of our authorities, we may from hence reasonably presume that the Dorians were induced to invade, and enabled to acquire, Sparta, by the invitation and assistance of a party in the interior of the country. Again, with respect to the Messenian Dorians, a different, but not less effectual temptation was presented by the alliance of the Arcadians in the south-western portion of that central region of Peloponnesus. Kresphontês the Herakleid leader, it is said, espoused the daughter¹ of the Arcadian king Kypselus, which procured for him the support of a powerful section of Arcadia. His settlement at Stenyklêrus was a considerable distance from the sea, at the north-east corner of Messenia,² close to the Arcadian frontier; and it will be seen hereafter that this Arcadian alliance is a constant and material element in the disputes of the Messenian Dorians with Sparta.

Causes which
favoured the
settlement.

We may thus trace a reasonable sequence of events, showing how two bodies of Dorians, having first assisted the Ætolo-Eleians to conquer the Pisatid, and thus finding themselves on the banks of the Alpheius, followed the upward course of that river, the one to settle at Sparta, the other at Stenyklêrus. The historian Ephorus, from whom our scanty fragments of information respecting these early settlements are derived—it is important to note that he lived in the age immediately succeeding the first foundation of Messênê as a city, the restitution of the long-exiled Messenians, and the amputation of the fertile western half of Laconia for their benefit, by Epameinondas—imparts to these proceedings an immediate decisiveness of effect which does not properly belong to them; as if the Spartans had become at once possessed of all Laconia, and the Messenians of all Messenia; Pausanias, too, speaks as if the Arcadians collectively had assisted and allied themselves with Kresphontês. This is the general spirit which pervades his account, though the particular facts, in so far as we find any such, do not always harmonise with it. Now we are ignorant of the pre-existing divisions of the country either east or west of Mount Taygetus, at the time when the Dorians invaded it. But to treat the one and the other as integral kingdoms, handed over at once to two Dorian leaders, is an illusion borrowed from the old legend, from the historicising fancies of Ephorus, and from the fact that in the well-known

Settlements
confined at
first to
Sparta and
Stenyklêrus.

¹ Pausan. iv. 3, 3; viii. 29, 4.

² Strabo (viii. p. 366) blames Euripidês for calling Messênê an inland country; but the poet seems to have been quite correct in doing so.

times this whole territory came to be really united under the Spartan power.

At what date the Dorian settlements at Sparta and Stenyklêrus were effected we have no means of determining. Yet that there existed between them in the earliest times a degree of fraternity which did not prevail between Lacedæmon and Argos, we may fairly presume from the common temple, with joint religious sacrifices, of Artemis Limnatis (or Artemis on the Marsh) erected on the confines of Messenia and Laconia.¹ Our first view of the two, at all approaching to distinctness, seems to date from a period about half a century earlier than the first Olympiad (776 B.C.),—about the reign of king Têleklos of the Eurystheneid or Agid line, and the introduction of the Lykurgæan discipline. Têleklos stands in the list as the eighth king dating from Eurysthenês. But how many of the seven kings before him are to be considered as real persons—or how much, out of the brief warlike expeditions ascribed to them, is to be treated as authentic history—I pretend not to define.

The earliest determinable event in the *internal* history of Sparta is the introduction of the Lykurgæan discipline; the earliest *external* events are the conquest of Amyklæ, Pharis, and Geronthræ, effected by king Têleklos, and the first quarrel with the Messenians, in which that prince was slain. When we come to see how deplorably great was the confusion and ignorance which reigned with reference to a matter so pre-eminently important as Lykurgus and his legislation, we shall not be inclined to think that facts much less important and belonging to an earlier epoch, can have been handed down upon any good authority. And in like manner when we learn that Amyklæ, Pharis, and Geronthræ (all south of Sparta, and the first only two and a half miles distant from that city) were independent of the Spartans until the reign of Têleklos, we shall require some decisive testimony before we can believe that a community, so small and so hemmed in as Sparta must then have been, had in earlier times undertaken expeditions against Helos on the sea-coast, against Kleitor on the extreme northern side of Arcadia, against the Kynurians, or against the Argeians. If Helos and Kynuria were conquered by these early kings, it appears that they had to be conquered a second time by kings succeeding Têleklos. It would be more natural that we should hear

¹ Pausan. iv. 2, 2. μετείχον δὲ αὐτοῦ μόνοι Δωρῶων οἱ τε Μεσσηνιοὶ καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι.

when and how they conquered the places nearer to them,—Selasia, or Belemina, the valley of the Cœnus or the upper valley of the Eurotas. But these seem to be assumed as matters of course; the proceedings ascribed to the early Spartan kings are such only as might besem the palmy days when Sparta was undisputed mistress of all Laconia.

The succession of Messenian kings, beginning with Kresphontês, the Herakleid brother, and continuing from father to son,—Æpytus, Glaukus, Isthmius, Dotadas, Subotas, ^{Messenian kings.} Phintas, the last being contemporary with Têlekus,—is still less marked by incident than that of the early Spartan kings. It is said that the reign of Kresphontês was troubled, and himself ultimately slain by mutinies among his subjects: Æpytus, then a youth, having escaped into Arcadia, was afterwards restored to the throne by the Arcadians, Spartans, and Argeians.¹ From Æpytus the Messenian line of kings are stated to have been denominated Æpytids in preference to Herakleids—which affords another proof of their intimate connexion with the Arcadians, since Æpytus was a very ancient name in Arcadian heroic antiquity.²

There is considerable resemblance between the alleged behaviour of Kresphontês on first settling at Stenyklêrus, and that of Eurysthenês and Proklês at Sparta—so far as we gather from statements, alike meagre and uncertified, resting on the authority of Ephorus. Both are said to have tried to place the pre-existing inhabitants of the country on a level with their own Dorian bands; both provoked discontents and incurred obloquy, with their contemporaries as well as with posterity, by the attempt; nor did either permanently succeed. Kresphontês was forced to concentrate all his Dorians in Stenyklêrus, while, after all, the discontents ended in his violent death. And Agis, the son of Eurysthenês, is said to have reversed all the liberal tentatives of his father, so as to bring the whole of Laconia into subjection and dependence on the Dorians at Sparta, with the single exception of Amyklæ. So odious to the Spartan Dorians was the conduct of Eurysthenês, that they refused to acknowledge him as their œkist, and conferred that honour upon Agis; the two lines of kings being called Agiads and Eurypontids, instead of Eurystheneids and Prokleids.³ We see in

Analogous representations in regard to the early proceedings both of Spartans and Messenians.

¹ Pausan. iv. 3, 5–6.

² Homer, Iliad, ii. 604.—

Οἱ δ' ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην, ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπῷ,

Αἰπύτιον παρὰ τύμβον.

Schol. ad loc. ὁ δ' Αἰπύτιος ἀρχαιότατος ἦρως, Ἀρκὰς τὸ γένος.

³ Compare the two citations from Ephorus, Strabo, viii. p. 361–365. Unfortunately a portion of the latter citation is

these statements the same tone of mind as that which pervades the Panathenaic oration of Isokratês the master of Ephorus,—the facts of an unknown period so coloured as to suit an *idéal* of haughty Dorian exclusiveness.

Again, as Eurysthenês and Proklês appear, in the picture of Ephorus, to carry their authority at once over the whole of Laconia, so too does Kresphontês over the whole of Messenia,—over the entire south-western region of Peloponnesus, westward of Mount Taygetus and Cape Tænarus, and southward of the river Neda. He sends an envoy to Pylus and Rhium, the western and southern portions of the south-western promontory of Peloponnesus, treating the entire territory as if it were one sovereignty, and inviting the inhabitants to submit under equal laws.¹ But it has already been observed, that this supposed oneness and indivisibility is not less uncertified in regard to Messenia than in regard to Laconia.

How large a proportion of the former territory these kings of Stenyklêrus may have ruled, we have no means of determining, but there were certainly portions of it which they did not rule—not merely during the reign of Têleklos at Sparta, but still later, during the first Messenian war. For not only we are informed that Têleklos established three townships, Poiêssa, Echeiæ,² and Tragium, near the Messenian

The kings
of Steny-
klêrus did
not possess
all Messenia.

incurably mutilated in the text; O. Müller (History of the Dorians, Book I. chap. v. 13) has proposed an ingenious conjecture, which however cannot be considered as trustworthy. Grosskurd, the German translator, usually skilful in these restorations, leaves the passage untouched.

For a new colouring of the death of Kresphontês, adjusted by Isokratês so as to suit the purpose of the address which he puts into the mouth of Archidamus king of Sparta, see the discourse in his works which passes under that name (Or. iv. p. 120–122). Isokratês says that the Messenian Dorians slew Kresphontês, whose children fled as suppliants to Sparta, imploring revenge for the death of their father, and surrendering the territory to the Spartans. The Delphian god advised the latter to accept the tender, and they accordingly attacked the Messenians, avenged Kresphontês, and appropriated the territory.

Isokratês always starts from the basis of the old legend,—the triple Dorian conquest made all at once: compare Panathenaic. Or. xii. p. 270–287.

¹ Ephorus ap. Strabo. viii. p. 361.

Dr. Thirlwall observes (Hist. of Greece, ch. vii. p. 300, 2nd edit.), “The Messenian Pylus seems long to have retained its independence, and to have been occupied for several centuries by one branch of the family of Neleus; for descendants of Nestor are mentioned as allies of the Messenians in their struggle with Sparta in the latter half of the seventh century B.C.”

For this assertion Dr. Thirlwall cites Strabo (viii. p. 355). I agree with him as to the matter of fact: I see no proof that the Dorians of Stenyklêrus ever ruled over what is called the Messenian Pylus; for, of course, if they did not rule over it before the second Messenian war, they never acquired it at all. But on reference to the passage in Strabo, it will not be found to prove anything to the point; for Strabo is speaking, not of the Messenian Pylus, but of the *Triphylia Pylus*: he takes pains to show that Nestor had nothing to do with the *Messenian Pylus*,—*Νέστωρος ἀπόγονοι* means the inhabitants of Triphylia near Lepreum: compare p. 350.

² Strabo, viii. p. 360. Concerning the situation of Korônê in the Messenian

Gulf and on the course of the river Nedon, but we read also a farther matter of evidence in the roll of Olympic victors. Every competitor for the prize at one of these great festivals was always entered as member of some autonomous Hellenic community, which constituted his title to approach the lists; if successful, he was proclaimed with the name of the community to which he belonged. Now during the first ten Olympiads seven winners are proclaimed as Messenians; in the eleventh Olympiad we find the name of Oxythemis Korônæus,—Oxythemis, not of Korôneia in Boeotia, but of Korônê in the western bend of the Messenian Gulf,¹ some miles on the right bank of the Pamisus, and a considerable distance to the north of the modern Coron. Now if Korônê had then been comprehended in Messenia, Oxythemis would have been proclaimed as a Messenian like the seven winners

Gulf, see Pausanias, iv. 34, 2; Strabo, viii. p. 361; and the observations of Colonel Leake, Travels in Morea, ch. x. vol. i. p. 439–448. He places it near the modern Petalidhi, seemingly on good grounds.

¹ See Mr. Clinton's Chronological Tables for the year 732 B.C.: O. Müller (in the Chronological Table subjoined to his history of the Dorians) calls this victor *Oxythemis of Korôneia*, in Boeotia. But this is inadmissible, on two grounds: 1. The occurrence of a Boeotian competitor in that early day at the Olympic games. The first eleven victors (I put aside Oxythemis, because he is the subject of the argument) are all from western and southern Peloponnesus: then come victors from Corinth, Megara, and Epidaurus; then from Athens; there is one from Thebes in the 41st Olympiad. I infer from hence that the celebrity and frequentation of the Olympic games increased only by degrees, and had not got beyond Peloponnesus in the eighth century B.C. 2. The name Korônæus, *Kopωναῖος*, is the proper and formal title for a citizen of Korônê, not for a citizen of Korôneia; the latter styles himself *Kopωνεύς*. The ethnical name *Kopωνεύς* as belonging to Korôneia in Boeotia is placed beyond doubt by several inscriptions in Boeckh's collection; especially No. 1583, in which a citizen of that town is proclaimed as victorious at the festival of the Charitesia at Orchomenus: compare Nos. 1587–1593, in which the same ethnical name occurs. The Boeotian Inscriptions attest in like manner the prevalence of the same etymological law in forming ethnical names,

for the towns near Korôneia: thus, *Charôneia* makes *Χαιρωνεύς*; *Lebadeia*, *Λεβαδεύς*; *Elateia*, *Ἐλατεὺς* or *Ἐλατειεύς*.

The Inscriptions afford evidence perfectly decisive as to the ethnical title under which a citizen of Korôneia in Boeotia would have caused himself to be entered and proclaimed at the Olympic games; better than the evidence of Herodotus and Thucydides, who both call them *Kopωναῖοι* (Herodot. v. 79; Thucyd. iv. 93): Polybius agrees with the Inscription, and speaks of the *Kopωνεῖς*, *Λεβαδεῖς*, *Χαιρωνεῖς* (xxvii. 1). O. Müller himself admits in another place (Orchomenos, p. 480) that the proper ethnical name is *Kopωνεύς*. The reading of Strabo (ix. p. 411) is not trustworthy: see Grosskurd *ad loc.*; compare Steph. Byz. *Kopώνεια* and *Kopώνη*.

In regard to the formation of ethnical names, it seems the general rule, that a town ending in *η* or *αι* preceded by a consonant had its ethnical derivative in *αιος*; such as *Σκιάνη*, *Τορώνη*, *Κύμη*, *Θήβαι*, *Ἀθήναι*; while names ending in *εια* had their ethnicon in *εύς*, as *Ἀλεξάνδρεια*, *Ἀμάσεια*, *Σελεῦκεια*, *Λυσιμάχεια* (the recent cities thus founded by the successors of Alexander are perhaps the best evidences that can be taken of the analogies of the language), *Μελάρπεια*, *Μελίτεια*, in addition to the Boeotian names of towns above quoted. There is however great irregularity in particular cases, and the number of towns called by the same name created an anxiety to vary the ethnicon for each: see Stephan. Byz. v. *Ἡράκλεια*.

who preceded him; and the fact of his being proclaimed as a Korônæan proves that Korônê was then an independent community, not under the dominion of the Dorians of Stenyklêrus. It seems clear therefore that the latter did not reign over the whole territory commonly known as Messenia, though we are unable to assign the proportion of it which they actually possessed.

The Olympic festival, in its origin doubtless a privilege of the neighbouring Pisatans, seems to have derived its great and gradually expanding importance from the Ætolo-Eleian settlement in Peloponnesus, combined with the Dorians of Laconia and Messenia. Lykurgus of Sparta and Iphitus of Elis are alleged to have joined their efforts for the purpose of establishing both the sanctity of the Olympic truce and the inviolability of the Eleian territory. Hence, though this tale is not to be construed as matter of fact, we may see that the Lacedæmonians regarded the Olympic games as a portion of their own antiquities. Moreover, it is certain both that the dignity of the festival increased simultaneously with their ascendancy,¹ and that their peculiar fashions were very early introduced into the practice of the Olympic competitors. Probably the three bands of co-operating invaders, Ætolians and Spartan and Messenian Dorians, may have adopted this festival as a periodical renovation of mutual union and fraternity; from which cause the games became an attractive centre for the western portion of Peloponnesus, before they were much frequented by people from the eastern, or still more from extra-Peloponnesian Hellas. For it cannot be altogether accidental, when we read the names of the first twelve proclaimed Olympic victors (occupying nearly half a century from 776 B.C. downwards), to find that seven of them are Messenians, three Eleians, one from Dymê in Achaia, and one from Korônê; while after the twelfth Olympiad, Corinthians, and Megarians and Epidaurians begin to occur; later still, extra-Peloponnesian victors. We may reasonably infer from hence that the Olympic ceremonies were at this early period chiefly frequented by visitors and competitors from the western regions of Peloponnesus, and that the affluence to them from the more distant parts of the Hellenic world did not become considerable until the first Messenian war had closed.

¹ The entire nakedness of the competitors at Olympia was adopted from the Spartan practice, seemingly in the 14th Olympiad, as is testified by the

epigram on Orsippus the Megarian. Previous to that period, the Olympic competitors had διαζώματα περὶ τὰ αἰδοῦν (Thucyd. i. 6).

Having thus set forth the conjectures, to which our very scanty knowledge points, respecting the first establishment of the Ætolian and Dorian settlements in Elis, Laconia, and Messenia, connected as they are with the steadily-increasing dignity and frequentation of the Olympic festival, I proceed in the next chapter to that memorable circumstance which both determined the character, and brought about the political ascendancy, of the Spartans separately : I mean the laws and discipline of Lycurgus.

Of the pre-existing inhabitants of Laconia and Messenia, whom we are accustomed to call Achæans and Pylians, so little is known, that we cannot at all measure the difference between them and their Dorian invaders, either in dialect, in habits, or in intelligence. There appear no traces of any difference of dialect among the various parts of the population of Laconia : the Messenian allies of Athens, in the Peloponnesian war, speak the same dialect as the Helots, and the same also as the Ambrakiotie colonists from Corinth : all Doric.¹ Nor are we to suppose that the Doric dialect was at all peculiar to the people called Dorians. As far as can be made out by the evidence of Inscriptions, it seems to have been the dialect of the Phokians, Delphians, Lokrians, Ætolians, and Achæans of Phthiôtis : with respect to the latter, the Inscriptions of Thaumaki in Achæa Phthiôtis afford a proof the more curious and the more cogent of native dialect, because the Phthiôts were both immediate neighbours and subjects of the Thessalians, who spoke a variety of the Æolic. So too, within Peloponnesus, we find evidences of Doric dialect among the Achæans in the north of Peloponnesus—the Dryopic inhabitants of Hermionê²—and the Eleuthero-Lacones, or Laconian townships (compounded of Perieki and Helots), emancipated by the Romans in the second century B.C. Concerning the speech of that population whom the invading Dorians found in Laconia, we have no means of judging : the presumption would rather be that it did not differ materially from the Doric. Thucydides designates the Corinthians, whom the invading Dorians attacked from the hill Solygeius, as being Æolians, and Strabo speaks both of the Achæans as an Æolic nation and of the Æolic dialect as having been originally preponderant in Peloponnesus.³ But we do not readily see what means of information

Previous inhabitants of southern Peloponnesus - how far different from the Dorians.

. ¹ Thucyd. iii. 112; iv. 41 : compare vii. 44, about the sameness of sound of the war-shout or pœan, as delivered by all the different Dorians.

² Corpus Inscriptt. Boeckh. Nos. 1771, 1772, 1773; Ahrens, De Dialecto Doricâ, sect. i.-ii. 48.

³ Thucyd. iv. 42; Strabo, viii. p. 333.

either of these authors possessed respecting the speech of a time which must have been four centuries anterior even to Thucydidês.

Of that which is called the Æolic dialect there are three marked and distinguishable varieties—the Lesbian, the Doric and Æolic dialect. Thessalian, and the Bœotian; the Thessalian forming a mean term between the other two. Ahrens has shown that the ancient grammatical critics are accustomed to affirm peculiarities, as belonging to the Æolic dialect generally, which in truth belong only to the Lesbian variety of it, or to the poems of Alkæus and Sappho, which these critics attentively studied. Lesbian Æolic, Thessalian Æolic, and Bœotian Æolic, are all different: and if, abstracting from these differences, we confine our attention to that which is common to all three, we shall find little to distinguish this abstract Æolic from the abstract Doric, or that which is common to the many varieties of the Doric dialect.¹ These two are sisters, presenting both of them more or less the Latin side of the Greek language, while the relationship of either of them to the Attic and Ionic is more distant. Now it seems that (putting aside Attica) the speech of all Greece,² from Perrhæbia and Mount Olympus to Cape Malea and Cape Akritas, consisted of different varieties either of the Doric or of the Æolic dialect; this being true (as far as we are able to judge) not less of the aboriginal Arcadians than of the rest. The Laconian dialect contained more specialties of its own, and approached nearer to the Æolic, and to the Eleian, than any other variety of the Dorian: it stands at the extreme of what has been classified as the strict Dorian—that is, the farthest removed from Ionic and Attic. The Kretan towns manifest also a strict Dorism;

¹ See the valuable work of Ahrens, *De Dialecto Æolicâ*, sect. 51. He observes, in reference to the Lesbian, Thessalian, and Bœotian dialects:—"Tres illas dialectos, quæ optimo jure Æolicæ vocari videntur—quia, qui illis usi sunt, Æoles erant—comparantem mirum habere oportet, quod Asianorum Æolum et Bœotorum dialecti tantum inter se distant, quantum vix ab aliâ quâvis Græcæ linguæ dialecto." (He then enumerates many points of difference;) "Contra tot tantasque differentias pauca reperiuntur eaque fere levia, quæ utrique dialecto, neque simul Doricæ, communia sint. . . Vides his comparatis tantum interesse inter utramque dialectum, ut dubitare liceat, an Æoles Bœoti non magis cum Æolibus Asianis conjuncti fuerint, quam qui hodie miro

quodam casu Saxones vocantur cum antiquis Saxonibus. Nihilominus Thessalicâ dialecto in comparationem vocatâ, diversissima quæ videntur aliquo vinculo conjungere licet. Quamvis enim pauca de eâ comperta habeamus, hoc tamen certum est, alia Thessalis cum Lesbiiis, alia cum solis Bœotis communia esse." (P. 222–223.)

² About the Æolic dialect of the Perrhæbians see Stephanus Byz. v. Γόννος, and ap. Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 335.

The Attic judgement in comparing these different varieties of Greek speech is expressed in the story of a man being asked—Whether the Bœotians or the Thessalians were most barbaric in speech? He answered—the Eleians (Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 304).

as well as the Lacedæmonian colony of Tarentum, and seemingly most of the Italiotic Greeks, though some of them are called Achæan colonies. Most of the other varieties of the Doric dialect (Phokian, Lokrian, Delphian, Achæan of Phthiôtis) exhibit a form departing less widely from the Ionic and Attic: Argos and the towns in the Argolic peninsula seem to form a stepping-stone between the two.

These positions represent all our scanty information respecting those varieties of Grecian speech which are not known to us by written works. The little presumption which can be raised upon them favours the belief that the Dorian invaders of Laconia and Messenia found there a dialect little different from that which they brought with them—a conclusion which it is the more necessary to state distinctly, since the work of O. Müller has caused an exaggerated estimate to be formed of the distinctive peculiarities whereby Dorism was parted off from the rest of Hellas.

CHAPTER VI.

LAWS AND DISCIPLINE OF LYKURGUS AT SPARTA.

PLUTARCH begins his biography of Lykurgus with the following ominous words:—

Lykurgus—
authorities
of Plutarch
respecting
him.

“Concerning the lawgiver Lyncurgus we can assert absolutely nothing which is not controverted: there are different stories in respect to his birth, his travels, his death, and also his mode of proceeding, political as well as legislative: least of all is the time in which he lived agreed upon.”

And this exordium is but too well borne out by the unsatisfactory nature of the accounts which we read, not only in Plutarch himself, but in those other authors out of whom we are obliged to make up our idea of the memorable Lykurgian system. If we examine the sources from which Plutarch's life of Lykurgus is deduced, it will appear that—excepting the poets Alkman, Tyrteus, and Simonidês, from whom he has borrowed less than we could have wished—he has no authorities older than Xenophon and Plato: Aristotle is cited several times, and is unquestionably the best of his witnesses, but the greater number of them belong to the century subsequent to that philosopher. Neither Herodotus nor Ephorus are named, though the former furnishes some brief but interesting particulars—and the latter also (as far as we can judge from the fragments remaining) entered at large into the proceedings of the Spartan lawgiver.¹

Lykurgus is described by Herodotus as uncle and guardian to king Labôtas, of the Eurystheneid or Agid line of Spartan kings; and this would place him, according to the received chronology, about 220 years before the first recorded Olympiad (about B.C. 996).² All the other accounts, on the contrary, seem to represent him as a younger brother, belonging to the other or Prokleid line of Spartan kings, though they do not perfectly agree respecting his parentage. While Simonidês stated him to be the son of Prytanis, Dieutyichidas described him as

¹ See Heeren, *Dissertatio de Fontibus Plutarchi*, p. 19–25.

² Herodot. i. 65. Moreover, Hero-

dotus gives this as the statement of the Lacedæmonians themselves.

grandson of Prytanis, son of Eunomus, brother of Polydektês, and uncle as well as guardian to Charilaus—thus making him eleventh in descent from Hêrâklês.¹ This latter account was adopted by Aristotle, coinciding, according to the received chronology, with the date of Iphitus the Eleian, and the first celebration of the Olympic games by Lykurgus and Iphitus conjointly,² which Aristotle accepted as a fact. Lykurgus, on the hypothesis here mentioned, would stand about B.C. 880, a century before the recorded Olympiads. Eratosthenês and Apollodorus placed him “not a few years earlier than the first Olympiad.” If they meant hereby the epoch commonly assigned as the Olympiad of Iphitus, their date would coincide pretty nearly with that of Herodotus; if on the other hand they meant the first recorded Olympiad (B.C. 776), they would be found not much removed from the opinion of Aristotle. An unequivocal proof of the inextricable confusion in ancient times respecting the epoch of the great Spartan lawgiver is indirectly afforded by Timæus, who supposed that there had existed two persons named Lykurgus, and that the acts of both had been ascribed to one. It is plain from hence that there was no certainty attainable, even in the third century before the Christian æra, respecting the date or parentage of Lykurgus.

Thucydidês, without mentioning the name of Lykurgus, informs us that it was “400 years and somewhat more” anterior Probable
date of Ly-
kurgus. to the close of the Peloponnesian war,³ when the Spartans

¹ Plutarch, Lykurg. c. 1. According to Dionys. Halik. (Ant. Rom. ii. 49) Lykurgus was uncle, not son, of Eunomus.

Aristotle considers Lykurgus as guardian of Charilaus (Politie. ii. 7, 1): compare v. 10, 3. See O. Müller (Hist. of Dorians, i. 7, 3).

² Phlegôn also adds Kleosthenês of Pisa (De Olympiis ap. Meursii Opp. vii. p. 128). It appears that there existed a quoit at Olympia, upon which the formula of the Olympic truce was inscribed together with the names of Iphitus and Lykurgus as the joint authors and proclaimers of it. Aristotle believed this to be genuine, and accepted it as an evidence of the fact which it professed to certify: and O. Müller is also disposed to admit it as genuine—that is, as *contemporary* with the times to which it professes to relate. I come to a different conclusion: that the quoit existed, I do not doubt; but that the inscription upon it was actually set down in writing in or near B.C. 880,

would be at variance with the reasonable probabilities resulting from Grecian paleography. Had this ancient and memorable instrument existed at Olympia in the days of Herodotus, he could hardly have assigned to Lykurgus the epoch which we now read in his writings.

The assertions in Müller's History of the Dorians (i. 7, 7), about Lykurgus, Iphitus, and Kleosthenês, “drawing up the fundamental law of the Olympic armistice,” are unsupported by any sufficient evidence. In the later times of established majesty of the Olympic festival, the Eleians did undoubtedly exercise the power which he describes; but to connect this with any deliberate regulation of Iphitus and Lykurgus, is in my judgement incorrect. See the mention of a similar truce proclaimed throughout Triphylia by the Makistians as presidents of the common festival at the temple of the Samian Poseidon (Strabo, viii. p. 343).

³ Thucyd. i. 18.

emerged from their previous state of desperate internal disorder, and entered upon "their present polity." We may fairly presume that this alludes to the Lykurgian discipline and constitution, which Thucydidês must thus have conceived as introduced about B.C. 830-820—coinciding with something near the commencement of the reign of king Têlekus. In so far as it is possible to form an opinion, amidst evidence at once so scanty and so discordant, I incline to adopt the opinion of Thucydidês as to the time at which the Lykurgian constitution was introduced at Sparta. The state of "eunomy" and good order which that constitution brought about—combined with the healing of great previous internal sedition, which had tended much to enfeeble them—is represented (and with great plausibility) as the grand cause of the victorious career beginning with king Têlekus, the conqueror of Amyklæ, Pharis, and Geronthræ. Therefore it would seem, in the absence of better evidence, that a date, connecting the fresh stimulus of the new discipline with the reign of Têlekus, is more probable than any epoch either later or earlier.¹

¹ Mr. Clinton fixes the legislation of Lykurgus, "in conformity with Thucydidês," at about 817 B.C., and his regency at 852 B.C., about thirty-five years previous (*Fasti Hellen.* v. i. c. 7, p. 141): he also places the Olympiad of Iphitus B.C. 828 (*F. H.* vol. ii. p. 410; *App.* c. 22).

In that chapter, Mr. Clinton collects and discusses the various statements respecting the date of Lykurgus: compare also Larcher ad *Herodot.* i. 67, and *Chronologie*, p. 486-492.

The differences in these statements must, after all, be taken as they stand, for they cannot be reconciled except by the help of arbitrary suppositions, which only mislead us by producing a show of agreement where there is none in reality. I agree with Mr. Clinton in thinking that the assertion of Thucydidês is here to be taken as the best authority. But I altogether dissent from the proceeding which he (in common with Larcher, Wesseling, Sir John Marsham, and others) employs with regard to the passage of Herodotus where that author calls Lykurgus the guardian and uncle of Labôtas (of the Eurystheneid line). Mr. Clinton says—"From the notoriety of the fact that Lykurgus was ascribed to the other house (the Prokleids), it is manifest that *the passage must be corrupted*" (p. 144); and he then goes on to correct the text of Herodotus,

agreeably to the proposition of Sir J. Marsham.

This proceeding seems to me inadmissible. The text of Herodotus reads perfectly well, and is not contradicted by anything to be found elsewhere in *Herodotus himself*: moreover, we have here a positive guarantee of its accuracy, for Mr. Clinton himself admits that it stood in the days of Pausanias just as we now read it (*Pausan.* iii. 2, 3). By what right then do we alter it? or what do we gain by doing so? Our only right to do so, is, the assumption that there must have been uniformity of belief, and means of satisfactory ascertainment, (respecting facts and persons of the ninth and tenth centuries before the Christian æra,) existing among Greeks of the fifth and succeeding centuries; an assumption which I hold to be incorrect. And all we gain is, an illusory unanimity produced by gratuitously putting words into the mouth of one of our witnesses.

If we can prove Herodotus to have been erroneously informed, it is right to do so; but we have no ground for altering his deposition. It affords a clear proof that there were very different stories as to the mere question, to which of the two lines of Herakleids the Spartan lawgiver belonged—and that there was an enormous difference as to the time in which he lived.

O. Müller,¹ after glancing at the strange and improbable circumstances handed down to us respecting Lykurgus, observes “that we have absolutely no account of him as an individual person.” This remark is perfectly just: but another remark made by the same distinguished author, respecting the Lykurgian system of laws, appears to me erroneous—and requires more especially to be noticed, inasmuch as the corollaries deduced from it pervade a large portion of his valuable history of the Dorians. He affirms that the laws of Sparta were considered the true Doric institutions, and that their origin was identical with that of the people: Sparta is, in his view, the full type of Dorian principles, tendencies, and sentiments—and is so treated throughout his entire work.² But such an opinion is at once gratuitous (for the passage of Pindar cited in support of it is scarcely of any value) and contrary to the whole tenor of ancient evidence. The institutions of Sparta were not Dorian, but peculiar to herself;³ distinguishing her not less from Argos, Corinth, Megara, Epidaurus, Sikyôn, Korkyra, or Knidus, than from Athens or Thebes. Krête was the only other portion of Greece in which there prevailed institutions in many respects analogous, yet still dissimilar in those two attributes which form the real mark and pinch of Spartan legislation, viz. the military discipline and the rigorous private training. There were doubtless Dorians in Krête, but we have no proof that these peculiar institutions belonged to them more than to the other inhabitants of the island. That the Spartans had an original organization and tendencies, common to them with the other Dorians, we may readily conceive; but the Lykurgian constitution impressed upon them a peculiar tendency which took them out of the general march, and rendered them the least fit of all states to be cited as an example of the class-attributes of Dorism. One of the essential causes, which made the Spartan institutions work so impressively upon the Grecian mind, was their perfect singularity, combined with the conspicuous ascendancy of the state in which they were manifested; while the Kretan communities, even admitting their partial resemblance (which was chiefly in the institution of the Syssitia, and was altogether more in form than in spirit) to Sparta, were too insigni-

Opinion of O. Müller (that Sparta is the perfect type of Dorian character and tendencies) is incorrect. Peculiarity of Sparta.

¹ History of the Dorians, i. 7, 6.

² History of the Dorians, iii. 1, 8. Alf. Kopstadt recognises this as an error in Müller's work: see his recent valuable Dissertation “De Rerum Læconicarum Constitutionis Lycurgeæ Ori-

gine et Indole,” Gryphiæ, 1849, sect. 3, p. 18.

³ Among the many other evidences to this point, see Aristotle, *Ethic.* x. 9; Xenophon, *Republ. Laced.* 10, 8.

ficant to attract notice except from speculative observers. It is therefore a mistake on the part of O. Müller, to treat Sparta as the type and representative of Dorians generally, and very many of the positions advanced in his *History of the Dorians* require to be modified when this mistake is pointed out.

The first capital fact to notice respecting the institutions ascribed to Lykurgus, is the very early period at which they had their commencement: it seems impossible to place this period later than 825 B.C. We do not find, nor have we a right to expect, trustworthy history in reference to events so early. If we have one foot on historical ground, inasmuch as the institutions themselves are real—the other foot still floats in the unfaithful region of mythe, when we strive to comprehend the generating causes: the mist yet prevails which hinders us from distinguishing between the god and the man. The light in which Lykurgus appeared, to an intelligent Greek of the fifth century before the Christian æra, is so clearly, yet briefly depicted, in the following passage of Herodotus, that I cannot do better than translate it:—

“In the very early times (Herodotus observes) the Spartans were among themselves the most lawless of all Greeks, and unapproachable by foreigners. Their transition to good legal order took place in the following manner. When Lycurgus, a Spartan of consideration, visited Delphi to consult the oracle, the instant that he entered the sanctuary, the Pythian priestess exclaimed,—

“Thou art come, Lycurgus, to my fat shrine, beloved by Zeus and by all the Olympic gods. Is it as God or as man that I am to address thee in the spirit? I hesitate—and yet, Lycurgus, I incline more to call thee a god.”

(So spake the Pythian priestess.) “Moreover, in addition to these words, some affirm that the Pythia revealed to him the order of things now established among the Spartans. *But the Lacedæmonians themselves* say, that Lycurgus, when guardian of his nephew Labôtas king of the Spartans, introduced these institutions out of Krête. No sooner had he obtained this guardianship, than he changed all the institutions into their present form, and took security against any transgression of it. Next, he constituted the military divisions, the Enômoties and the Triakads, as well as the Syssitia or public mess: he also, farther, appointed the ephors and the senate. By this means the Spartans passed from bad to good order: to Lycurgus, after his death, they built a temple, and they

still worship him reverentially. And as might naturally be expected in a productive soil, and with no inconsiderable numbers of men, they immediately took a start forward, and flourished so much that they could not be content to remain tranquil within their own limits," &c.

Such is our oldest statement (coming from Herodotus) respecting Lykurgus, ascribing to him that entire order of things which the writer witnessed at Sparta. Thucydides also, though not mentioning Lykurgus, agrees in stating that the system among the Lacedæmonians, as he saw it, had been adopted by them four centuries previously,—had rescued them from the most intolerable disorders, and had immediately conducted them to prosperity and success.¹ Hellanikus, whose writings a little preceded those of Herodotus, not only did not (any more than Thucydides) make mention of Lykurgus, but can hardly be thought to have attached any importance to the name; since he attributed the constitution of Sparta to the first kings, Eurysthenes and Proklês.²

But those later writers, from whom Plutarch chiefly compiled his biography, profess to be far better informed on the subject of Lykurgus, and enter more into detail. His father, we are told, was assassinated during the preceding state of lawlessness; his elder brother Polydektês died early, leaving a pregnant widow, who made to Lykurgus propositions that he should marry her and become king. But Lykurgus, repudiating the offer with indignation, awaited the birth of his young nephew Charilaus, held up the child publicly in the agora as the future king of Sparta, and immediately relinquished the authority which he had provisionally exercised. However, the widow and her brother Leonidas raised slanderous accusations against him, of designs menacing to the life of the infant king, —accusations which he deemed it proper to obviate by a temporary absence. Accordingly he left Sparta and went to Krête, where he studied the polity and customs of the different cities; next he visited Ionia and Egypt, and (as some authors affirmed) Libya, Iberia, and even India. While in Ionia, he is reported to have obtained from the descendants of Kreophylus a copy of the Homeric poems, which had not up to that time become known in Peloponnesus: there were not wanting authors, indeed, who said that he had conversed with Homer himself.³

Little said about Lykurgus in the earlier authors.

Copious details of Plutarch.

Regency of Lykurgus—his long absence from Sparta.

¹ Herodot. i. 65-66; Thucyd. i. 18.

² Strabo, viii. p. 363.

³ Plutarch, Lykurg. 3, 4, 5.

Meanwhile the young king Charilaus grew up and assumed the sceptre, as representing the Prokleid or Eurypontid family. But the reins of government had become more relaxed, and the disorders worse than ever, when Lykurgus returned. Finding that the two kings as well as the people were weary of so disastrous a condition, he set himself to the task of applying a corrective, and with this view consulted the Delphian oracle; from which he received strong assurances of the divine encouragement, together with one or more special injunctions (the primitive Rhetraë of the constitution) which he brought with him to Sparta.¹ He then suddenly presented himself in the agora, with thirty of the most distinguished Spartans, all in arms, as his guards and partisans. King Charilaus, though at first terrified, when informed of the designs of his uncle, stood forward willingly to second them; while the bulk of the Spartans respectfully submitted to the venerable Herakleid who came as reformer and missionary from Delphi.² Such were the steps by which Lykurgus acquired his ascendancy: we have now to see how he employed it.

He is sent by the Delphian oracle to reform the state.

His first proceeding, pursuant to the Rhetra or Compact brought from Delphi, was to constitute the Spartan senate, consisting of twenty-eight ancient men; making an aggregate of thirty in conjunction with the two kings, who sat and voted in it. With this were combined periodical assemblies of the Spartan people, in the open air, between the river Knakiôn and the bridge Babyka. Yet no discussion was permitted in these assemblies,—their functions were limited to the simple acceptance or rejection of that which had previously been determined in the senate.³ Such was the Spartan political con-

His institutions ascribed to him—senate and popular assembly—ephors.

¹ For an instructive review of the text as well as the meaning of this ancient Rhetra, see Urlichs, Ueber die Lycurgischen Rhetraë, published since the first edition of this History. His refutation of the rash changes of Götting seems to me complete: but his own conjectures are not all equally plausible; nor can I subscribe to his explanation of ἀφιστάσθαι.

² Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 5-6. Hermippus, the scholar of Aristotle, professed to give the names of twenty out of these thirty devoted partisans.

There was however a different story, which represented that Lykurgus, on his return from his travels, found Charilaus governing like a despot (Heraclid.

Pontic. c. 2).

³ The words of the old Rhetra—*Διὸς Ἑλλανίου καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς Ἑλλανίας ἱερὸν ἰδρυσάμενον, φυλὰς φυλάξαντα, καὶ ὡς αὖς ὠβάξαντα, τριάκοντα, γερουσίαν σὺν ἀρχαγέταις, καταστήσαντα, ὥρας ἐξ ὥρας ἀπελλάζειν μετὰ Βαβύκα καὶ Κνακίωνος, οὕτως εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι δάμω δ' ἀγορὰν εἶμεν καὶ κράτος.* (Plutarch, *ib.*)

The reading *ἀγορὰν* (last word but three) is that of Coray's edition: other readings proposed are *κυρίαν*, *ἀνωγὰν*, *ἀγορίαν*, &c. The MSS. however are incurably corrupt, and none of the conjectures can be pronounced certain.

The Rhetra contains various remarkable archaisms, — *ἀπελλάζειν* — *ἀφίστα-*

stitution as fixed by Lykurgus; but a century afterwards (so Plutarch's account runs), under the kings Polydôrus and Theopompus, two important alterations were made. A rider was then attached to the old Lykurgian Rhētra, by which it was provided that "in case the people decided crookedly, the senate with the kings should reverse their decisions:"¹ while another change,

σθαί — the latter word in the sense of putting the question for decision, corresponding to the function of the Ἀφειστήρ at Knidus (Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 4; see Schneider, *Lexicon, ad voc.*).

O. Müller connects τριάκοντα with ὠβας, and lays it down that there were thirty Obes at Sparta: I rather agree with those critics who place the comma after ὠβάξαντα, and refer the number thirty to the senate. Urlichs, in his Dissertation Ueber Die Lykurgisch. Rhetren (published in the Rheinisches Museum for 1847, p. 204), introduces the word πρεσβυγενέας after τριάκοντα, which seems a just conjecture when we look to the addition afterwards made by Theopompus. The statements of Müller about the Obes seem to me to rest on no authority.

The word Rhētra means a solemn compact, either originally emanating from, or subsequently sanctioned by the gods, who are always parties to such agreements; see the old Treaty between the Eleians and Heræans, — Ἀ Ῥήτρα, between the two, — commemorated in the valuable inscription still preserved, — as ancient, according to Boeckh, as Olymp. 40–60 (Boeckh, *Corp. Inscript. No. II. p. 26, Part I.*). The words of Tyrtaeus imply such a compact between contracting parties: first the kings, then the senate, lastly the people — εὐθείαις ῥήτραις ἀνταπαμειβομένοις — where the participle last occurring applies not to the people alone, but to all the three. The Rhētra of Lykurgus emanated from the Delphian god; but the kings, senate, and people all bound themselves, both to each other and to the gods, to obey it. The explanations given of the phrase by Nitzsch and Schömann (in Dr. Thirlwall's note, ch. viii. p. 334) seem to me less satisfactory than what appears in C. F. Hermann (*Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalterthümer, s. 23*).

Nitzsch (*Histor. Homer. sect. xiv. p. 50–55*) does not take sufficient account of the distinction between the meaning

of ῥήτρα in the early and in the later times. In the time of the Ephor Epitadeus, or of Agis III., he is right in saying that ῥήτρα is equivalent to *scitum* — still however, with an idea of greater solemnity and unchangeability than is implied in the word νόμος, analogous to what is understood by a fundamental or organic enactment in modern ideas. The old ideas of a mandate from the Delphian god, and a compact between the kings and the citizens, which had once been connected with the word, gradually dropped away from it. There is no contradiction in Plutarch, therefore, such as that to which Nitzsch alludes (p. 54).

Kopstadt's Dissertation (p. 22, 30) touches on the same subject. I agree with Kopstadt (*Dissert. p. 28–30*) in thinking it probable that Plutarch copied the words of the old Lykurgian constitutional Rhētra, from the account given by Aristotle of the Spartan polity.

King Theopompus probably brought from the Delphian oracle the important rider which he tacked to the mandate as originally brought by Lykurgus — οἱ βασιλεῖς Θεόπομπος καὶ Πολύδωρος τὰδε τῇ ῥήτρᾳ παρένεγραψαν. The authority of the oracle, together with their own influence, would enable them to get these words accepted by the people.

¹ Αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἔλοιτο, τοὺς πρεσβυγενέας καὶ ἀρχαγέτας ἀποστατήρας εἶμεν. (Plutarch, *ib.*)

Plutarch tells us that the primitive Rhētra, anterior to this addition, specially enjoined the assembled citizens either to adopt or reject, without change, the Rhētra proposed by the kings and senate, and that the rider was introduced because the assembly had disobeyed this injunction, and adopted amendments of its own. It is this latter sense which he puts on the word σκολιὰν. Urlichs (*Ueber Lyc. Rhetr. p. 232*) and Nitzsch (*Hist. Homer. p. 54*) follow him, and the latter even construes the epithet Εὐθείαις ῥήτραις ἀνταπαμειβομένων of Tyrtaeus in a corresponding sense: he says, "Populus

perhaps intended as a sort of compensation for this bridle on the popular assembly, introduced into the constitution a new executive Directory of five men, called the Ephors. This Board—annually chosen, by some capricious method the result of which could not well be foreseen, and open to be filled by every Spartan citizen,—either originally received, or gradually drew to itself, functions so extensive and commanding, in regard to internal administration and police, as to limit the authority of the kings to little more than the exclusive command of the military force. Herodotus was informed at Sparta that the ephors as well as the senate had been constituted by Lykurgus; but the authority of Aristotle as well as the internal probability of the case, sanctions the belief that they were subsequently added.¹

iis (rhetris) εὐθείαις, i. e. *nil inflexis*, suffragari jubetur: nam lex cujus Tyrtaeus admonet, ita sanxerat—si populus rogationem *inflexam* (i. e. non nisi ad suum arbitrium immutatam) accipere voluerit, senatores et auctores abolento totam.”

Now in the first place, it seems highly improbable that the primitive Rhetra, with its antique simplicity, would contain any such preconceived speciality of restriction upon the competence of the assembly. That restriction received its formal commencement only from the rider annexed by king Theopompus, which evidently betokens a previous dispute and refractory behaviour on the part of the assembly.

In the second place, the explanation which these authors give of the words *σκολιὰν* and *εὐθείαις*, is not conformable to the ancient Greek, as we find it in Homer and Hesiod: and these early analogies are the proper test, seeing that we are dealing with a very ancient document. In Hesiod, *ἰὺς* and *σκολιδς* are used in a sense which almost exactly corresponds to *right* and *wrong* (which words indeed in their primitive etymology may be traced back to the meaning of *straight* and *crooked*). See Hesiod, Opp. Di. 36, 192, 218, 221, 226, 230, 250, 262, 264; also Theogon. 97, and Fragn. 217, ed. Götting: where the phrases are constantly repeated, *ἰθεῖαι δίκαι, σκολιαὶ δίκαι, σκολιοὶ μῦθοι*. There is also the remarkable expression, Opp. Di. 9. *ῥεῖα δὲ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιόν*: compare v. 263. *ἰθύνετε μύθους*: also Homer, Iliad, xvi. 387. *Οἳ βίη εἰν ἀγορῇ σκολιάς κρίνωσι θέμιστας*; and xxiii. 530. *ἰθεῖα*; xviii. 508. *ὅς μετὰ τοῖσι*

δίκην ἰθύντατα-εἴπη, &c.

If we judge by these analogies, we shall see that the words of Tyrtaeus, *εὐθείαις ῥήτραις*, mean “*straightforward, honest, statutes or conventions*”—not *propositions adopted without change*, as Nitzsch supposes. And so the words *σκολιὰν* *ἐλοῖτο*, mean, “*adopt a wrong or dishonest determination*”—not a determination different from what was proposed to them.

These words gave to the kings and senate power to cancel any decision of the public assembly which they disapproved. It retained only the power of refusing assent to some substantive propositions of the authorities, first of the kings and senate, afterwards of the ephors. And this limited power it seems always to have preserved.

Kopstadt explains well the expression *σκολιὰν*, as the antithesis to the epithet of Tyrtaeus, *εὐθείαις ῥήτραις* (Dissertat. sect. 15, p. 124).

¹ Herod. i. 65; compare Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 7; Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 1 (where he gives the answer of king Theopompus).

Aristotle tells us that the ephors were chosen, but not *how* they were chosen; only that it was in some manner excessively puerile,—*παιδариώδης γὰρ ἐστὶ λίαν* (ii. 6, 16).

M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire in his note to the passage of Aristotle, presumes that they were of course chosen in the same manner as the senators; but there seems no sufficient ground in Aristotle to countenance this. Nor is it easy to reconcile the words of Aristotle respecting the election of the senators, where he assimilates it to an *αἵρεσις δυναστευ-*

Taking the political constitution of Sparta ascribed to Lykurgus, it appears not to have differed materially from the rude organization exhibited in the Homeric poems, where we always find a council of chiefs or old men and occasional meetings of a listening agora. It is hard to suppose that the Spartan kings can ever have governed without some formalities of this sort; so that the innovation (if innovation there really was) ascribed to Lykurgus, must have consisted in some new details respecting the senate and the agora,—in fixing the number¹ thirty, and the life-tenure of the former—and the special place of meeting of the latter as well as the extent of privilege which it was to exercise; consecrating the whole by the erection of the temples of Zeus Hellanius and Athênê Hellania. The view of the subject presented by Plutarch as well as by Plato,² as if the senate were an entire novelty, does not consist with the pictures of the old epic. Hence we may more naturally imagine that the Lykurgian political constitution, apart from the ephors who were afterwards tacked to it, presents only the old features of the heroic government of Greece, defined and regularised in a particular manner. The presence of two co-existent and co-ordinate kings, indeed, succeeding in hereditary descent and both belonging to the gens of Herakleids, is something peculiar to Sparta—the origin of which receives no other explanation than a reference to the twin sons of Aristodêmus, Eurysthenês and Proklês. These two primitive ancestors are a type of the two lines of Spartan kings; for they are said to have passed their lives in perpetual dissensions, which was the habitual state of the two contemporaneous kings at Sparta. While the co-existence of the pair of kings, equal in power and constantly thwarting each other, had often a baleful effect upon the course of public measures, it was nevertheless a security to the state against successful violence,³ ending in the establishment of a despotism, on the part of any ambitious individual among the regal line.

Constitution ascribed to Lykurgus agrees with that which we find in Homer.

Pair of kings at Sparta—their constant dissensions—a security to the state against despotism.

During five successive centuries of Spartan history, from Polydôrus and Theopompus downward, no such violence was attempted by any of the kings,⁴ until the times of Agis III. and Kleomenês III.

τῆς (Polit. v. 5, 8; ii. 6, 18), with the description which Plutarch (Lycurg. 26) gives of that election.

¹ Kopstadt agrees in this supposition, that the number of the senate was probably not peremptorily fixed before the Lykurgian reform (Dissertat. ut sup. sect. 13, p. 109).

² Plato, Legg. iii. p. 691; Plato Epist. viii. p. 354, B.

³ Plato, Legg. iii. p. 691; Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 20.

⁴ The conspiracy of Pausanias, after the repulse of Xerxes, was against the liberty of combined Hellas, to constitute himself satrap of Hellas under the

(240 B.C. to 220 B.C.) The importance of Greece had at this last-mentioned period irretrievably declined, and the independent political action which she once possessed had become subordinate to the more powerful force either of the Ætolian mountaineers (the rudest among her own sons) or to Epirotic, Macedonian, and Asiatic foreigners, preparatory to the final absorption by the Romans. But amongst all the Grecian states, Sparta had declined the most; her ascendancy was totally gone, and her peculiar training and discipline (to which she had chiefly owed it) had degenerated in every way. Under these untoward circumstances, two young kings, Agis and Kleomenês—the former a generous enthusiast, the latter more violent and ambitious—conceived the design of restoring the Lykurgæan constitution in its supposed pristine purity, with the hope of reviving both the spirit of the people and the ascendancy of the state. But the Lykurgæan constitution had been, even in the time of Xenophon,¹ in part, an *idéal*, not fully realised in practice—much less was it a reality in the days of Kleomenês and Agis; moreover it was an *idéal* which admitted of being coloured according to the fancy or feelings of those reformers who professed, and probably believed, that they were aiming at its genuine restoration. What the reforming kings found most in their way, was, the uncontrolled authority, and the conservative dispositions, of the ephors—which they naturally contrasted with the original fulness of the kingly power, when kings and senate stood alone. Among the various ways in which men's ideas of what the primitive constitution *had* been, were modified by the feelings of their own time (we shall presently see some other instances of this), is probably to be reckoned the assertion of Kleomenês respecting the first appointment of the ephors. Kleomenês affirmed that the ephors had originally been nothing more than subordinates and deputies of the kings, chosen by the latter to perform for a time their duties during the long absence of the Messenian war. Starting from this humble position, and profiting by the dissensions of the two kings,² they had in process of time, especially by the ambition of the ephor Asterôpus, found means first to constitute themselves

Idea of
Kleomenês
III. respect-
ing the first
appointment
of the
Ephors.

Persian monarch, rather than against the established Lacedæmonian government; though undoubtedly one portion of his project was to excite the Helots to revolt, and Aristotle treats him as specially aiming to put down the power of the ephors (Polit. v. 5, 6;

compare Thucyd. i. 128–134; Herodot. v. 32).

¹ Xenophon, Republic. Laced. c. 14.

² Plutarch, Agis, c. 12. Τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἀρχεῖον (the ephors) ἰσχύειν ἐκ διαφοράς τῶν βασιλέων, &c.

an independent board, then to usurp to themselves more and more of the kingly authority, until they at last reduced the kings to a state of intolerable humiliation and impotence. As a proof of the primitive relation between the kings and the ephors, he alluded to that which was the custom at Sparta in his own time. When the ephors sent for either of the kings, the latter had a right to refuse obedience to two successive summonses, but the third summons he was bound to obey.¹

It is obvious that the fact here adduced by Kleomenês (a curious point in Spartan manners) contributes little to prove the conclusion which he deduced from it of the original nomination of the ephors as mere deputies by the kings. That they were first appointed at the time of the Messenian war is probable, and coincides with the tale that king Theopompus was a consenting party to the measure—that their functions were at first comparatively circumscribed, and extended by successive encroachments, is also probable. But they seem to have been from the beginning a board of specially popular origin, in contraposition to the kings and the senate. One proof of this is to be found in the ancient oath, which was every month interchanged between the kings and the ephors; the king swearing for himself, that he would exercise his regal functions according to the established laws—the ephors swearing on behalf of the city, that his authority should on that condition remain unshaken.² This mutual compact, which probably formed a part of the ceremony during the monthly sacrifices offered by the king,³ continued down to a time when it must have become a pure form, and when the kings had long been subordinate in power to the ephors. But it evidently began first as a reality—when the king was predominant and effective chief of the state, and when the ephors, clothed with functions chiefly defensive, served as guarantees to the people against abuse of the regal authority. Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero,⁴ all interpret the original institution of the ephors as designed to

Popular origin of the board of ephors—oath interchanged between them and the kings.

¹ Plutarch, Kleomenês, c. 10. σημείον δὲ τούτου, τὸ μέχρι νῦν, μεταπεμπομένων τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἐφόρων, &c.

² Xenophon, Republic. Lacedæmon. c. 15. Καὶ ὄρκους μὲν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ μῆνα ποιοῦνται Ἐφόροι μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, βασιλεὺς δ' ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ ὄρκος ἐστὶ, τῷ μὲν βασιλεῖ, κατὰ τοὺς τῆς πόλεως κεμένους νόμους βασιλεύσειν τῇ δὲ πόλει, ἐμπεδοκοῦντος ἐκείνου, ἀστυφέλικτον τὴν βασιλείαν παρέξειν.

³ Herodot. vi. 57.

⁴ Plato, Legg. iii. p. 692; Aristot. Polit. v. 11, 1; Cicero de Republic. Fragm. ii. 33, ed. Maii—"Ut contra consulare imperium tribuni plebis, sic illi (ephori) contra vim regiam constituti;"—also De Legg. iii. 7, and Valer. Max. iv. i.

Compare Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 7; Tittmann, Griechisch. Staatsverfassung, p. 103, seqq.

protect the people and restrain the kings: the latter assimilates them to the tribunes at Rome.

Such were the relations which had once subsisted between the kings and the ephors: though in later times these relations had been so completely reversed, that Polybius considers the former as essentially subordinate to the latter—reckoning it as a point of duty in the kings to respect the ephors “as their fathers.”¹ And such is decidedly the state of things throughout all the better-known period of history which we shall hereafter traverse. The ephors are the general directors of public affairs² and the supreme controlling board holding in check every other authority in the state, without any assignable limit to their powers. The extraordinary ascendancy of these magistrates is particularly manifested in the fact stated by Aristotle, that they exempted themselves from the public discipline, so that their self-indulgent year of office stood in marked contrast with the toilsome exercises and sober mess common to rich and poor alike. The kings are reduced to a certain number of special functions, combined with privileges partly religious, partly honorary: their most important political attribute is, that they are *ex officio* generals of the military force on foreign expeditions. But even here we trace the sensible decline of their power. For whereas Herodotus was informed, and it probably had been the old privilege, that the king could levy war against whomsoever he chose, and that no Spartan could impede him on pain of committing sacrilege³—we shall see throughout the best known periods of this history that it is usually the ephors (with or without the senate and public assembly) who determine upon war—the king only takes the command when the army is put on the march. Aristotle seems to treat the Spartan king as a sort of hereditary general; but even in this privilege, shackles were put upon him—for two out of the five ephors accompanied the army, and their power seems to have been not seldom invoked to ensure obedience to his orders.⁴

¹ Polyb. xxiv. 8,

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 14–16; Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ διαίτα τῶν Ἐφόρων οὐχ ὁμολογουμένη τῷ βουλήματι τῆς πόλεως· αὐτῇ μὲν γὰρ ἀνειμένη λίαν ἐστὶ· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις μᾶλλον ὑπερβαλλεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ σκληρὸν, &c.

³ Herodot. vi. 56.

⁴ Aristot. ii. 7, 4; Xenoph. Republ. Laced. c. 13. Πανσαντας, πείσας τῶν Ἐφόρων τρεῖς, ἐξάγει φρουράν, Xenoph.

Hellen. ii. 4. 29; φρουρὰν ἔφηναν οἱ Ἐφοροί, iii. 2, 23.

A special restriction was put on the functions of the king, as military commander-in-chief, in 417, B.C., after the ill-conducted expedition of Agis son of Archidamus against Argos. It was then provided that ten Spartan counsellors should always accompany the king in every expedition (Thucyd. v. 63).

The direct political powers of the kings were thus greatly curtailed; yet importance in many ways was still left to them. They possessed large royal domains, in many of the townships of the Periœki: they received frequent occasional presents, and when victims were offered to the gods, the skins and other portions belonged to them as perquisites;¹ they had their votes in the senate, which, if they were absent, were given on their behalf by such of the other senators as were most nearly related to them: the adoption of children received its formal accomplishment in their presence—and conflicting claims at law, for the hand of an unbequeathed orphan heiress, were adjudicated by them. But above all, their root was deep in the religious feelings of the people. Their pre-eminent lineage connected the entire state with a divine paternity. They, the chiefs of the Herakleids, were the special grantees of the soil of Sparta from the gods—the occupation of the Dorians being only sanctified and blest by Zeus for the purpose of establishing the children of Hêraklês in the valley of the Eurotas.² They represented the state in its relations with the gods, being by right, priests of Zeus Lacedæmon (the ideas of the god and the country coalescing into one) and of Zeus Uranius, and offering the monthly sacrifices necessary to ensure divine protection to the people. Though individual persons might sometimes be put aside, nothing short of a new divine revelation could induce the Spartans to step out of the genuine lineage of Eurysthenês and Proklês. Moreover, the remarkable mourning ceremony which took place at the death of every king, seems to indicate that the two kingly families—which counted themselves Achæan,³ not Dorian—were considered as the great common bond of union between the three component parts of the population of Laconia—Spartans, Periœki, and Helots. Not merely was it required, on this occasion, that two members of every house in Sparta should appear in sackcloth and ashes—but the death of the king was formally made known throughout every part of Laconia; and

¹ The hide-money (*δερματικὸν*) arising from the numerous victims offered at public sacrifices at Athens, is accounted for as a special item of the public revenue in the careful economy of that city: see Boeckh. *Public Econ. of Athens*, iii. 7. p. 333; Eng. Trans. *Corpus Inscription. No. 157*.

² *Tyrtæus*, *Fragm. 1*, ed. Bergk; *Strabo*, xviii. p. 362:—

Αὐτὸς γὰρ Κρονίων καλλιστεφάνον πόσις Ἕρως
Ζεὺς Ἡρακλείδαις τήνδε δέδωκε πόλιν

Οἷσιν ἅμα προλιπόντες Ἐρίνεον ἡμετέοντα
Εὐρείαν Πέλοπος νήσον ἐψικόμεθα.

Compare *Thucyd. v. 16*; *Herodot. v. 39*; *Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 3, 3*; *Plutarch, Lysand. c. 22*.

³ *Herod. v. 72*. See the account in *Plutarch* of the abortive stratagem of *Lysander* to make the kingly dignity elective, by putting forward a youth who passed for the son of *Apollo* (*Plutarch, Lysand. c. 25–26*).

deputies from the townships of the Periœki and the villages of the Helots, to the number of several thousand, were summoned to Sparta to take their share in the profuse and public demonstrations of sorrow,¹ which lasted for ten days, and which imparted to the funeral obsequies a superhuman solemnity. Nor ought we to forget, in enumerating the privileges of the Spartan king, that he (conjointly with two officers called Pythii nominated by him) carried on the communications between the state and the temple of Delphi, and had the custody of oracles and prophecies generally. In most of the Grecian states, such inspired declarations were treasured up, and consulted in cases of public emergency: but the intercourse of Sparta with the Delphian oracle was peculiarly frequent and intimate, and the responses of the Pythian priestess met with more reverential attention from the Spartans than from any other Greeks.² So much the more important were the king's functions, as the medium of this intercourse: the oracle always upheld his dignity, and often even seconded his underhand personal schemes.³

Sustained by so great a force of traditional reverence, a Spartan king of military talent and individual energy like Agesilaus exercised great ascendancy; but such cases were very rare, and we shall find the king throughout the historical period only a secondary force, available on special occasions. For real political orders, in the greatest cases as well as the least, the Spartan looks to the council of ephors, to whom obedience is paid with a degree of precision which nothing short of the Spartan discipline could have brought about—by the most powerful citizens not less than by the meanest.⁴ Both the internal police and the foreign affairs of the state are in the hands of the ephors, who exercise an authority approaching to despotism, and altogether without accountability. They appoint and direct the body of 300 young and active citizens, who performed the immediate police service of Laconia: they cashier at pleasure any subordinate functionary, and inflict fine or arrest at their own discretion: they assemble the military force, on occasion of foreign war, and determine its destination, though the king has the actual command of it: they imprison on suspicion even the regent or the

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 3, 1. Ἄγῳς — ἐτυχε σεμνοτέρας ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον ταφῆς.

² For the privileges of the Spartan kings, see Herodot. vi. 56–57; Xenophon, Republ. Laced. c. 15; Plato, Alcib.

i. p. 123.

³ Herodot. vi. 66, and Thucyd. v. 16, furnish examples of this.

⁴ Xenophon, Republ. Laced. c. 8, 2, and Agesilaus, cap. 7, 2.

king himself:¹ they sit as judges, sometimes individually and sometimes as a board, upon causes and complaints of great moment, and they judge without the restraint of written laws, the use of which was peremptorily forbidden by a special Rhetra,² erroneously connected with Lykurgus himself, but at any rate ancient. On certain occasions of peculiar moment they take the sense of the senate and the public assembly³—such seems to have been the habit on questions of war and peace. It appears however that persons charged with homicide, treason, or capital offences generally, were tried before the senate. We read of several instances in which the kings were tried and severely fined, and in which their houses were condemned to be razed to the ground, probably by the senate on the proposition of the ephors:

¹ Xenoph. Rep. Laced. 8, 4; Thucyd. i. 131; Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 14—*ἀρχὴν λίαν μεγάλην καὶ ἰσοτύραννον*. Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 13—*μὴ χρῆσθαι νόμοις ἐγγράφοις*.

Plato, in his Republic, in like manner disapproves of any general enactments tying up beforehand the discretion of perfectly educated men like his guardians, who will always do what is best on each special occasion (Republic, iv. p. 425).

² Besides the primitive constitutional Rhetra mentioned above, page 116, various other Rhetrae are also attributed to Lykurgus; and Plutarch singles out three under the title of "The Three Rhetrae," as if they were either the only genuine Lycurgean Rhetrae, or at least stood distinguished by some peculiar sanctity from all others (Plutarch, Quæst. Roman. c. 87. Agesilaus, c. 26).

These three were (Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 13; comp. Apophth. Lacon. p. 227). —1. Not to resort to written laws. 2. Not to employ in housebuilding any other tools than the axe and the saw. 3. Not to undertake military expeditions often against the same enemies.

I agree with Nitzsch (Histor. Homer. p. 61–65) that these Rhetrae, though doubtless not actually Lycurgean, are nevertheless ancient (that is, probably dating somewhere between 650–550 B.C.) and not the mere fictions of recent writers, as Schömann (Ant. Jur. Pub. iv. 1; xiv. p. 132) and Ulrichs (p. 241) seem to believe. And though Plutarch specifies the number *three*, yet there seem to have been still more, as the language of Tyrtæus must be held to

indicate; out of which, from causes which we do not now understand, the three which Plutarch distinguishes excited particular notice.

These maxims or precepts of state were probably preserved along with the dicta of the Delphian oracle, from which authority doubtless many of them may have emanated—such as the famous ancient prophecy 'Α φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲν (Krebs, Lectiones Diodoreæ, p. 140. Aristotel. Περὶ Πολιτειῶν, ap. Schol. ad Eurip. Andromach. 446. Schömann, Comm. ad Plutarch. Ag. et Cleomen. p. 123).

Nitzsch has good remarks in explanation of the prohibition against "using written laws." This prohibition was probably called forth by the circumstance that other Grecian states were employing lawgivers like Zaleukus, Drako, Charondas, or Solon—to present them at once with a series of written enactments or provisions. Some Spartans may have proposed that an analogous lawgiver should be nominated for Sparta; upon which proposition a negative was put in the most solemn manner possible, by a formal Rhetra, perhaps passed after advice from Delphi. There is no such contradiction therefore (when we thus conceive the event) as some authors represent, in forbidding the use of written laws by a Rhetra itself put into writing. To employ a phrase in greater analogy with modern controversies—"The Spartans, on the direction of the oracle, resolve to retain their unwritten common law, and not to codify."

³ Ἐδοξε τοῖς Ἐφόροις καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Xen. Hellen. iii. 2, 23).

in one instance, it seems that the ephors inflicted by their own authority a fine even upon Agesilaus.¹

War and peace appear to have been submitted, on most, if not on all occasions, to the senate and the public assembly; ^{Public assembly.} no matter could reach the latter until it had passed through the former. And we find some few occasions on which the decision of the public assembly was a real expression of opinion, and operative as to the result—as for example, the assembly which immediately preceded and resolved upon the Peloponnesian war. Here, in addition to the serious hazard of the case and the general caution of a Spartan temperament, there was the great personal weight and experience of king Archidamus opposed to the war, though the ephors were favourable to it.² The public assembly, under such peculiar circumstances, really manifested an opinion and came to a division. But for the most part, it seems to have been little better than an inoperative formality. The general rule permitted no open discussion, nor could any private citizen speak except by special leave from the magistrates. Perhaps even the general liberty to discuss, if given, might have been of no avail, for not only was there no power of public speaking, but no habit of canvassing public measures, at Sparta: nothing was more characteristic of the government than the extreme secrecy of its proceedings.³ The propositions brought forward by the magistrates were either accepted or rejected, without any licence of amending. There could be no attraction to invite the citizen to be present at such an assembly: and we may gather from the language of Xenophon that in his time it consisted only of a certain number of notables specially summoned in addition to the senate, which latter body is itself called “the lesser Ekklesia.”⁴ Indeed the constant and for-

¹ The case of *Leotychides*, Herod. vi. 72; of *Pleistoanax*, Thucyd. ii. 21–v. 16; *Agis II.*, Thucyd. v. 63; *Agis III.*, Plutarch, *Agis*, c. 19: see Plutarch, *Agesilaus*, c. 5.

Respecting the ephors generally, see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthumskunde*, v. 4, 42, vol. i. p. 223; Cragius, *Rep. Lac.* ii. 4, p. 121.

Aristotle distinctly marks the ephors as *ἀντιπρόβουλοι*: so that the story alluded to briefly in the *Rhetoric* (iii. 18) is not easy to be understood.

² Thucyd. i. 67, 80, 87. *ξύλλογον σφῶν αὐτῶν τὸν εἰωθότα.*

³ Thucyd. iv. 68. *τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρυπτόν*: compare iv. 74; also his remarkable expression about so distin-

guished a man as *Brasidas*, *ἦν δὲ οὐκ ἄδύνατος, ὥς Λακεδαιμόνιος, εἰπεῖν*, and iv. 24, about the Lacedæmonian envoys to Athens. Compare Schömann, *Antiq. Jur. Pub. Græc.* iv. 1, 80, p. 122. *Aristotel. Polit.* ii. 8, 3.

⁴ *Τὴν μικρὰν καλουμένην ἐκκλησίαν* (Xenoph. *Hellen.* iii. 3, 8), which means the *γέροντες* or senate, and none besides, except the ephors, who convoked it. (See Lachmann, *Spart. Verfass.* sect. 12, p. 216.) What is still more to be noted, is the expression *οἱ ἐκκληστοί* as the equivalent of *ἡ ἐκκλησία* (compare *Hellen.* v. 2, 11; vi. 3, 3), evidently showing a special and limited number of persons convened: see also ii. 4, 38; iv. 6, 3; v. 2, 33; Thucyd. v. 77.

midable diminution in the number of qualified citizens was alone sufficient to thin the attendance of the assembly, as well as to break down any imposing force which it might once have possessed.

An assembly thus circumstanced—though always retained as a formality, and though its consent on considerable matters and for the passing of laws (which however seems to have been a rare occurrence at Sparta) was indispensable—could be very little of a practical check upon the administration of the ephors. The Senate, a permanent body with the kings included in it, was the only real check upon them, and must have been to a certain extent a concurrent body in the government—though the large and imposing language in which its political supremacy is spoken of by Demosthenês and Isokratês exceeds greatly the reality of the case. Its most important function was that of a court of criminal justice, before whom every man put on trial for his life was arraigned.¹ But both in this and in their other duties, we find the senators as well as the kings and the ephors charged with corruption and venality.² As they were not appointed until sixty years of age and then held their offices for life, we may readily believe that some of them continued to act after the period of extreme and disqualifying senility—which, though the extraordinary respect of the Lacedæmonians for old age would doubtless tolerate it, could not fail to impair the influence of the body as a concurrent element of government.

The brief sketch here given of the Spartan government will show, that though Greek theorists found a difficulty in determining under what class they should arrange it,³ it was in substance a close, unscrupulous, and well-obeyed oligarchy—including within it, as subordinate, those portions which had once been dominant, the kings and the senate, and softening the odium,

The expression *οἱ ἐκκληῖται* could never have got into use as an equivalent for the Athenian ecclesia.

¹ Xenoph. *Repub. Laced.* 10; Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 6, 17; iii. 1, 7; Demosthen. *cont. Leptin.* c. 23. p. 489; Isokratês, *Or.* xii. (*Panathenaic.*) p. 266. The language of Demosthenês seems particularly inaccurate.

Plutarch (*Agessilaus*, c. 32), on occasion of some suspected conspirators who were put to death by Agessilaus and the ephors, when Sparta was in imminent danger from the attack of Epameinondas, asserts, that this was the first time that any Spartan had ever been put to death without trial.

² Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 6, 18. Compare also Thucyd. i. 131 about the guilty Pausanias, —πιστεύων χρήμασι διαλύσειν τὴν διαβολήν: Herodot. v. 72; Thucyd. v. 16—about the kings Leotychides and Pleistoanax; the brave and able Gylippus—Plutarch, *Lysand.* c. 16.

³ The ephors are "sometimes considered as a democratical element, because every Spartan citizen had a chance of becoming ephor; sometimes as a despotical element, because in the exercise of their power they were subject to little restraint and no responsibility: see Plato, *Legg.* iv. p. 712; Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 3, 10; iv. 7, 4, 5.

The Senate.

Spartan constitution—
a close oligarchy.

without abating the mischief, of the system, by its annual change of the ruling ephors. We must at the same time distinguish the government from the Lykurgian discipline and education, which doubtless tended much to equalise rich and poor, in respect to practical life, habits, and enjoyments. Herodotus (and seemingly also Xenophon) thought that the form just described was that which the government had originally received from the hand of Lykurgus. Now, though there is good reason for supposing otherwise, and for believing the ephors to be a subsequent addition—yet the mere fact, that Herodotus was so informed at Sparta, points our attention to one important attribute of the Spartan polity, which it is proper to bring into view. This attribute is, its unparalleled steadiness for four or five successive centuries, in the midst of governments like the Grecian, all of which had undergone more or

Long duration of the constitution without formal change—one cause of the respect in Greece and pride in the Spartans themselves.

less of fluctuation. No considerable revolution—not even any palpable or formal change—occurred in it from the days of the Messenian war down to those of Agis III.: in spite of the irreparable blow which the power and territory of the state sustained from Epameinondas and the Thebans, the form of government nevertheless remained unchanged. It was the only government in Greece which could trace an unbroken peaceable descent from a high antiquity and from its real or supposed founder. Now this was one of the main circumstances (among others which will hereafter be mentioned) of the astonishing ascendancy which the Spartans acquired over the Hellenic mind, and which they will not be found at all to deserve by any superior ability in the conduct of affairs. The steadiness of their political sympathies—exhibited at one time by putting down the tyrants or despots, at another by overthrowing the democracies—stood in the place of ability, and even the recognised failings of their government were often covered by the sentiment of respect for its early commencement and uninterrupted continuance. If such a feeling acted on the Greeks generally,¹ much more powerful was its action upon the Spartans themselves in inflaming that haughty exclusiveness for which they stood distinguished. And it is to be observed that the Spartan mind continued to be cast on the old fashioned scale, and unsusceptible of modernizing influences, longer than that of most other people of Greece. The ancient legendary faith, and devoted submission to the Delphian oracle, remained among them unabated,

¹ A specimen of the way in which | in Isokratês, Or. xii. (Panathenaic.) p. this antiquity was lauded, may be seen | 288.

at a time when various influences had considerably undermined it among their fellow-Hellens and neighbours. But though the unchanged title and forms of the government thus contributed to its imposing effect, both at home and abroad, the causes of internal degeneracy were not the less really at work, in undermining its efficiency. It has been already stated that the number of qualified citizens went on continually diminishing, and even of this diminished number a larger proportion than before were needy, since the landed property tended constantly to concentrate itself in fewer hands. There grew up in this way a body of discontent, which had not originally existed, both among the poorer citizens, and among those who had lost their franchise as citizens; thus aggravating the danger arising from Perioeki and Helots, who will be presently noticed.

We pass from the political constitution of Sparta to the civil ranks and distribution, economical relations, and lastly the peculiar system of habits, education and discipline, said to have been established among the Lacedæmonians by Lykurgus. Here again we shall find ourselves imperfectly informed as to the existing institutions, and surrounded by confusion when we try to explain how those institutions arose.

It seems however ascertained that the Dorians in all their settlements were divided into three tribes—the Hylleis, the Pamphyli, and the Dymanes: in all Dorian cities moreover, there were distinguished Herakleid families from whom œkists were chosen when new colonies were formed.

Dorians
divided into
three tribes
— Hylleis,
Pamphyli,
and Dy-
manes.

These three tribes can be traced at Argos, Sikyôn, Epidaurus, Trœzên, Megara, Korkyra, and seemingly also at Sparta.¹ The Hylleis recognised, as their eponym and progenitor, Hyllus the son of Hêrâklês, and were therefore in their own belief descended from Hêrâklês himself: we may suppose the Herakleids, specially so called, comprising the two regal families, to have been the Elder Brethren of the tribe of Hylleis, the whole of whom are sometimes spoken of as Herakleids or descendants of Hêrâklês.² But there seem to have been also at Sparta, as in other Dorian towns, non-Dorian inhabitants, apart from these three tribes and embodied in tribes of their own. One of these, the Ægeids, said to have come from Thebes as allies of the Dorian invaders, is named by Aristotle,

¹ Herodot. v. 68; Stephan. Byz. v. Ἰλλεῖς and Δυμῶν; O. Müller, Dorians, iii. 5, 2; Boeckh. ad Corp. Inscript. No. 1123.

Thucyd. i. 24, about Phalios the Herakleid at Corinth.

² See Tyrtæus, Fragm. 8, 1, ed. Schneidewin, and Pindar, Pyth. i. 61. v. 71, where the expressions "descendants of Hêrâklês" plainly comprehend more than the two kingly families. Plutarch, Lysand. c. 22; Diodor. xi. 58.

Pindar, and Herodotus¹—while the Ægialeis at Sikyôn, the tribe Hyrnêthia at Argos and Epidaurus, and others whose titles we do not know at Corinth, represent in like manner the non-Dorian portions of their respective communities.² At Corinth the total number of tribes is said to have been eight.³ But at Sparta, though we seem to make out the existence of the three Dorian tribes, we do not know how many tribes there were in all; still less do we know what relation the Obæ or Obês, another subordinate distribution of the people, bore to the tribes. In the ancient Rhetra of Lykurgus, the Tribes and Obês are directed to be maintained unaltered: but the statement of O. Müller and Boeckh⁴—that there were thirty Obês in all, ten to each tribe—rests upon no other evidence than a peculiar punctuation of this Rhetra, which various other critics reject; and seemingly with good reason. We are thus left without any information respecting the Obê, though we know that it was an old, peculiar, and lasting division among the Spartan people, since it occurs in the oldest Rhetra of Lykurgus, as well as in late inscriptions of the date of the Roman empire. In similar inscriptions and in the account of Pausanias, there is how-

Local distinctions known among the Spartans.

ever recognised a classification of Spartans distinct from and independent of the three old Dorian tribes, and founded upon the different quarters of the city—Limnæ, Mesoa, Pitanê and Kynosura;⁵ from one of these four was derived the usual description of a Spartan in the days of Herodotus. There

¹ Herodot. iv. 149; Pindar, Pyth. v. 67; Aristot. Λακων. Πολιτ. p. 127, Fragm. ed. Neuman. The Talthybiadæ, or heralds at Sparta, formed a family or caste apart (Herod. vii. 134).

O. Müller supposes, without any proof, that the Ægeids must have been adopted into one of the three Dorian tribes; this is one of the corollaries from his fundamental supposition, that Sparta is the type of pure Dorism (vol. ii. p. 78). Kopstadt thinks (Disseratat. p. 67) that I have done injustice to O. Müller in not assenting to his proof: but on studying the point over again, I can see no reason for modifying what is here stated in the text. The section of Schömann's work (Antiq. Jur. Publ. Græc., iv. 1, 6. p. 115) on this subject asserts a great deal more than can be proved.

² Herod. v. 68–92; Boeckh, Corp. Inscript. Nos. 1130, 1131; Stephan. Byz. v. Ἰρνίθειον; Pausan. ii. 28, 3.

³ Photius Πάντα ὀκτώ; also Proverb. Vatic. Suidas, xi. 64; compare Hesy-

chius, v. Κυνόφαλοι.

⁴ Müller, Dorians, iii. 5, 3–7; Boeckh, ad Corp. Inscription. Part. iv. sect. 3. p. 609.

⁵ Pausan. iii. 16, 6; Herodot. iii. 55; Boeckh, Corp. Inscriptt. Nos. 1241, 1338, 1347, 1425; Steph. Byz. v. Μεσόα; Strabo, viii. p. 364; Hesych. v. Πιτάνη.

There is much confusion and discrepancy of opinion about the Spartan tribes. Cragius admits six (De Republ. Lacon. i. 6); Meursius, eight (Rep. Lacon. i. 7); Barthélemy (Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis, iv. p. 185) makes them five. Manso has discussed the subject at large, but I think not very satisfactorily, in the eighth Beilage to the first book of his History of Sparta (vol. ii. p. 125); and Dr. Thirlwall's second Appendix (vol. i. p. 517) both notices all the different modern opinions on this obscure topic, and adds several useful criticisms. Our scanty stock of original evidence leaves much room for divergent hypotheses, and little chance of any certain conclusion.

is reason to suppose that the old Dorian tribes became antiquated at Sparta (as the four old Ionian tribes did at Athens), and that the topical classification derived from the quarters of the city superseded it—these quarters having been originally the separate villages, of the aggregate of which Sparta was composed.¹ That the number of the old senators, thirty, was connected with the three Dorian tribes, deriving ten members from each, is probable enough, though there is no proof of it.

Of the population of Laconia three main divisions are recognised—Spartans, Perioeki, and Helots. The first of the three were the full qualified citizens, who lived in Sparta itself, fulfilled all the exigences of the Lykurgian discipline, paid their quota to the Syssitia or public mess, and were alone eligible to honours² or public offices. These men had neither time nor taste even for cultivation of the land, still less for trade or handicraft: such occupations were inconsistent with the prescribed training, even if they had not been positively interdicted. They were maintained from the lands round the city, and from the large proportion of Laconia which belonged to them; the land being tilled for them by Helots, who seem to have paid over to them a fixed proportion of the produce: in some cases at least, as much as one half.³ Each Spartan retained his qualification, and transmitted it to his children, on two conditions—first, that of submitting to the prescribed discipline; next, that of paying each his stipulated quota to the public mess, which was only maintained by these individual contributions. The multiplication of children in the poorer families, after acquisitions of new territory ceased, continually augmented both the number and the proportion of citizens who were unable to fulfil the second of these conditions, and who therefore lost their franchise: so that there arose towards the close of the Peloponnesian war a distinction, among the Spartans themselves, unknown to the earlier times—the reduced number of fully qualified citizens being called The Equals or Peers—the disfranchised poor, The Inferiors. The latter, disfranchised as they were, nevertheless did not become Perioeki: it was probably still competent to them to resume their qualification, should any favourable accident enable them to make their contributions to the public mess.

¹ Thucyd. i. 10.

² One or two Perioekic officers appear in military command towards the end of the Peloponnesian war (Thucyd. viii. 6, 22), but these seem rare exceptions even as to foreign service by sea or

land, while a Perioekus as magistrate at Sparta was unheard of.

³ One half was paid by the enslaved Messenians (Tyrtaeus, Frag. 4, Bergk):
 ἡμισυ πᾶν, ὅσον κέρπον ἄρουρα φέρει.

The Pericæus was also a freeman and a citizen, not of Sparta,

but of some one of the hundred townships of Laconia.¹

2. Pericæi.

Both he and the community to which he belonged received their orders only from Sparta, having no political sphere of their own, and no share in determining the movements of the Spartan authorities. In the island of Kythêra,² which formed one of the Pericæic townships, a Spartan bailiff resided as administrator. But whether the same was the case with others, we cannot affirm: nor is it safe to reason from one of these townships to all—there may have been considerable differences in the mode of dealing with one and another. For they were spread through the whole of Laconia, some near and some distant from Sparta: the free inhabitants of Amyklæ must have been Pericæi, as well as those of Kythêra, Thuria, Ætheia, or Aulôn: nor can we presume that the feeling on the part of the Spartan authorities towards all of them was the same. Between the Spartans and their neighbours, the numerous Pericæi of Amyklæ, there must have subsisted a degree of intercourse and mutual relation in which the more distant Pericæi did not partake—besides that both the religious edifices and the festivals of Amyklæ were most reverentially adopted by the Spartans and exalted into a national dignity: and we seem to perceive, on some occasions, a degree of consideration manifested for the Amyklæan hoplites,³ such as perhaps other Pericæi might not have obtained. The class-name, Pericæi⁴—Circum-residents,

¹ Strabo, viii. p. 362. Stephanus Byz. alludes to this total of 100 townships in his notice of several different items among them—*Ἀνθάνα—πόλις Λακωνικῇ μία τῶν ἑκατον*; also v. *Ἀφροδισιᾶς, Βοῖαι, Δυβράχιον*, &c.; but he probably copied Strabo, and therefore cannot pass for a distinct authority. The total of 100 townships belongs to the maximum of Spartan power, after the conquest and before the severance of Messenia; for Aulôn, Boiæ and Methônê (the extreme places) are included among them.

Mr. Clinton (Fast. Hellen. ii. p. 401) has collected the names of above 60 out of the 100.

² Thucyd. iv. 53.

³ Xenophon, Hellen. iv. 5, 11; Herod. ix. 7; Thucyd. v. 18–23. The Amyklæan festival of the Hyacinthia, and the Amyklæan temple of Apollo, seem to stand foremost in the mind of the Spartan authorities. *Αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐγγύτατα τῶν περιολικῶν* (Thucyd. iv. 8), who are ready before the rest and march against the Athenians at Pylus, probably in-

clude the Amyklæans.

Laconia generally is called by Thucydides (iii. 16) as the *περιοικίς* of Sparta.

⁴ The word *περίοικοι* is sometimes used to signify simply “surrounding neighbour states,” in its natural geographical sense: see Thucyd. i. 17, and Aristot. Polit. ii. 7, 1.

But the more usual employment of it is, to mean, the unprivileged or less privileged members of the same political aggregate living without the city, in contrast with the full privileged burghers who lived within it. Aristotle uses it to signify in Krête the class corresponding to the Lacedæmonian Helots (Pol. ii. 7, 3): there did not exist in Krête any class corresponding to the Lacedæmonian Pericæi. In Krête there were not two stages of inferiority—there was only one, and that one is marked by the word *περίοικοι*; while the Lacedæmonian Pericæus had the Helot below him. To an Athenian the word conveyed the idea of undefined degradation.

or dwellers around the city—usually denoted native inhabitants of inferior political condition as contrasted with the full-privileged burghers who lived in the city, but it did not mark any precise or uniform degree of inferiority. It is sometimes so used by Aristotle as to imply a condition no better than that of the Helots, so that in a large sense, all the inhabitants of Laconia (Helots as well as the rest) might have been included in it. But when used in reference to Laconia, it bears a technical sense whereby it is placed in contraposition with the Spartan on one side, and with the Helot on the other: it means native freemen and proprietors, grouped in subordinate communities¹ with more or less power of local manage-

To understand better the *status* of the Periækus, we may contrast him with the Metækus or Metic. The latter resides in the city, but he is an alien resident on sufferance, not a native: he pays a special tax, stands excluded from all political functions, and cannot even approach the magistrate except through a friendly citizen or Prostatēs (*ἐπὶ προστὰτος οἰκῶν*—Lycurgus cont. Leocrat. c. 21-53): he bears arms for the defence of the state. The situation of a Metic was however very different in different cities of Greece. At Athens that class were well protected in person and property, numerous and domiciliated: at Sparta, there were at first none—the Xenêlasy excluded them; but this must have been relaxed long before the days of Agis III.

The Periækus differs from the Metic in being a native of the soil, subject by birth to the city law.

M. Kopstadt (in his Dissertation above cited on Lacedæmonian affairs, sect. 7, p. 60) expresses much surprise at that which I advance in this note respecting Krête and Lacedæmon—that in Krête there was no class of men analogous to the Lacedæmonian Periæki, but only two classes—i. e. free citizens and Helots. He thinks that this position is "prorsus falsum."

But I advance nothing more here than what is distinctly stated by Aristotle, as Kopstadt himself admits (p. 60, 71). Aristotle calls the subject class in Krête by the name of *Περίοικοι*. And in this case, the general presumptions go far to sustain the authority of Aristotle. For Sparta was a dominant or capital city, including in its dependence not only a considerable territory, but a considerable number of inferior, distinct, organised townships. In Krête, on the contrary, each autonomous state in-

cluded only a town with its circumjacent territory, but without any annexed townships. There was therefore no basis for the intermediate class called in Laconia Periæki: just as Kopstadt himself remarks (p. 78) about the Dorian city of Megara. There were only the two classes of free Krêtan citizens, and serf-cultivators in various modifications and subdivisions.

Kopstadt (following Hoeck, Krêta, B. III. vol. iii. p. 23) says that the authority of Aristotle on this point is overborne by that of Dosiadas and Sosikratês—authors who wrote specially on Krêtan affairs. Now if we were driven to make a choice, I confess that I should prefer the testimony of Aristotle—considering that we know little or nothing respecting the other two. But in this case I do not think that we are driven to make a choice: Dosiadas (ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 143) is not cited in terms, so that we cannot affirm him to contradict Aristotle; and Sosikratês (upon whom Hoeck and Kopstadt rely) says something which does not necessarily contradict him, but admits of being explained so as to place the two witnesses in harmony with each other.

Sosikratês says (ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 263), *Τὴν μὲν κοινὴν δουλείαν οἱ Κρήτες καλοῦσι μνοίαν, τὴν δὲ ἰδίαν ἀφαμίωτας, τοὺς δὲ περιόικους ὑπηκόους*. Now the word *περιόικους* seems to be here used just as Aristotle would have used it, to comprehend the Krêtan serfs universally: it is not distinguished from *μνώται* and *ἀφαμῖωται*, but comprehends both of them as different species under a generic term. The authority of Aristotle affords a reason for preferring to construe the passage in this manner, and the words appear to me to admit of it fairly.

¹ The *πόλεις* of the Lacedæmonian Periæki are often noticed: see Xeno-

ment, but (like the subject towns belonging to Bern, Zurich, and most of the old thirteen cantons of Switzerland) embodied in the Lacedæmonian aggregate, which was governed exclusively by the kings, senate, and citizens of Sparta.

When we come to describe the democracy of Athens after the revolution of Kleisthenes, we shall find the demes, or local townships and villages of Attica, incorporated as equal and constituent fractions of the integer called The Deme (or The City) of Athens, so that a demot of Acharnæ or Sphêttus is at the same time a full Athenian citizen. But the relation of the Pericæic townships to Sparta is one of inequality and obedience, though both belong to the same political aggregate, and make up together the free Lacedæmonian community. In like manner, Orneæ and other places were townships of men personally free, but politically dependent on Argos—Akræphiæ on Thebes—Chæroneia on Orchomenus—and various Thessalian towns on Pharsalus and Larissa.¹ This condition carried with it a sentiment of degradation, and a painful negation of that autonomy for which every Grecian community thirsted ;² while being maintained through superior force, it had a natural tendency, perhaps without the deliberate wish of the reigning city, to degenerate into practical oppression. But in addition to this general tendency, the peculiar education of a Spartan, while it imparted force, fortitude, and regimental precision, was at the same time so rigorously peculiar, that it rendered him harsh, unaccommodating, and incapable of sympathising with the ordinary march of Grecian feeling,—not to mention the rapacity and love of money, which is attested, by good evidence, as belonging to the Spartan character,³ and which we should hardly have expected to find in the pupils of Lykurgus. As Harmosts out of their native city,⁴ and in relations with inferiors, the Spartans seem to have been more unpopular than other Greeks, and we may presume that a similar haughty roughness pervaded their dealings with their own Pericæi ; who were bound to them certainly by no tie of affection, and who for the most part revolted after the battle

phon (Agesilaus, ii. 24; Laced. Repub. xv. 3; Hellenic. vi. 5, 21).

¹ Herod. viii. 73-135; Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 1-8; Thucyd. iv. 76-94.

² Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 3, 5, 9, 19. Isokratês, writing in the days of Theban power, after the battle of Leuktra, characterises the Boeotian towns as *περίλοι* of Thebes (Or. viii. De Pace, p. 182); compare Orat. xiv. Plataic. p. 299-303. Xenophon holds the same language,

Hellen. v. 4, 46: compare Plutarch, Agesilaus, 28.

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 23.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 77-95; vi. 105. Isokratês (Panathenaic. Or. xii. p. 283), *Σπαρτιάτας δὲ ὑπεροπτικὸς καὶ πολεμικὸς καὶ πλεονέκτας, οἷους περ αὐτοὺς εἶναι πάντες ὑπειλήφασιν*. Compare his Oratio de Pace (Or. viii. p. 180-181); Oratio Panegyri. (Or. iv. p. 64-67).

of Leuktra as soon as the invasion of Laconia by Epaminondas enabled them to do so with safety.

Isokratês, taking his point of departure from the old Herakleid legend, with its instantaneous conquest and triple partition of all Dorian Peloponnesus among the three Herakleid brethren, deduces the first origin of the Periœkic townships from internal seditions among the conquerors of Sparta. According to him, the period immediately succeeding the conquest was one of fierce intestine warfare in newly-conquered Sparta, between the Few and the Many,—the oligarchy and the demus. The former being victorious, two important measures were the consequences of their victory. They banished the defeated Many from Sparta into Laconia, retaining the residence in Sparta exclusively for themselves; they assigned to them the smallest and least fertile half of Laconia, monopolising the larger and better for themselves; and they disseminated them into many very small townships, or subordinate little communities, while they concentrated themselves entirely at Sparta. To these precautions for ensuring dominion they added another not less important. They established among their own Spartan citizens equality of legal privilege and democratical government, so as to take the greatest securities for internal harmony; which harmony, according to the judgement of Isokratês, had been but too effectually perpetuated, enabling the Spartans to achieve their dominion over oppressed Greece,—like the accord of pirates¹ for the spoliation of the peaceful. The Periœkic townships (he tells us), while deprived of all the privileges of freemen, were exposed to all the toils, as well as to an unfair share of the dangers, of war. The Spartan authorities put them in situations and upon enterprises which they deemed too dangerous for their own citizens; and what was still worse, the ephors possessed the power of putting to death, without any form of preliminary trial, as many Periœki as they pleased.²

The statement here delivered by Isokratês, respecting the first origin of the distinction of Spartans and Periœki, is nothing better than a conjecture, nor is it even a probable conjecture, since it is based on the historical truth of the old Herakleid legend, and

¹ Isokratês, Panathenaic. Or. xii. p. 280. ὥστε οὐδεὶς ἂν αὐτοὺς διὰ γε τὴν ὁμόνοιαν δικαίως ἐπαινέσειεν, οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς καταποντιστὰς καὶ λήστας καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀδικίας ὄντας· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ὁμοιοῦντες τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπολλύουσι.

² Isokratês, Orat. xii. (Panathenaic.)

p. 270–271. The statement in the same oration (p. 246), that the Lacedæmonians “had put to death without trial more *Greeks* (πλείους τῶν Ἑλλήνων) than had ever been tried at Athens since Athens was a city,” refers to their allies or dependants out of Laconia.

Statement
of Isokratês
as to the
origin of the
Periœki.

transports the disputes of his own time between the oligarchy and the demus into an early period to which such disputes do not belong. Nor is there anything, as far as our knowledge of Grecian history extends, to bear out his assertion that the Spartans took to themselves the least dangerous post in the field, and threw undue peril upon their Periœki. Such dastardly temper was not among the sins of Sparta; but it is undoubtedly true, that as the number of citizens continually diminished, so the Periœki came to constitute, in the later times, a larger and larger proportion of the Spartan force. Yet the power which Isokratês represents to have been vested in the ephors, of putting to death Periœki without preliminary trial, we may fully believe to be real, and to have been exercised as often as the occasion seemed to call for it. We shall notice presently the way in which these magistrates dealt with the Helots, and shall see ample reason from thence to draw the conclusion, that whenever the ephors believed any man to be dangerous to the public peace,—whether an inferior Spartan, a Periœkus, or a Helot,—the most summary mode of getting rid of him would be considered as the best. Towards Spartans of rank and consideration they were doubtless careful and measured in their application of punishment, but the same necessity for circumspection did not exist with regard to the inferior classes: moreover the feeling, that the exigences of justice required a fair trial before punishment was inflicted, belongs to Athenian associations much more than to Spartan. How often any such summary executions may have taken place, we have no information.

We may remark that the account which Isokratês has here given of the origin of the Laconian Periœki is not essentially irreconcilable with that of Ephorus,¹ who recounted that Eurysthenês and Proklês, on first conquering Laconia, had granted to the pre-existing population equal rights with the Dorians—but that Agis, son of Eurysthenês, had deprived them of this equal position, and degraded them into dependent subjects of the latter. At least the two narratives both agree in presuming that the Periœki had once enjoyed a better position, from which they had been extruded by violence. And the policy which Isokratês ascribes to the victorious Spartan oligarchs,—of driving out the demus from concentrated residence in the city to disseminated residence in many separate and insignificant townships,—seems to be the expression of that proceeding which in his time was

Statement of Ephorus—different from Isokratês, yet not wholly irreconcilable.

¹ Ephorus, *Fragm.* 18, ed Marx; ap. Strabo. viii. p. 365,

numbered among the most efficient precautions against refractory subjects,—the *Diœkisis*, or breaking up of a town-aggregate into villages. We cannot assign to the statement any historical authority.¹ Moreover the division of Laconia into six districts, together with its distribution into townships (or the distribution of settlers into pre-existing townships), which Ephorus ascribed to the first Dorian kings, are all deductions from the primitive legendary account, which described the Dorian conquest as achieved at one stroke, and must all be dismissed, if we suppose it to have been achieved gradually. This gradual conquest is admitted by O. Müller and by many of the ablest subsequent inquirers—who nevertheless seem to have the contrary supposition involuntarily present to their minds when they criticise the early Spartan history, and always unconsciously imagine the Spartans as masters of all Laconia. We cannot even assert that Laconia was ever under one government before the consummation of the successive conquests of Sparta.

Of the assertion of O. Müller—repeated by Schömann²—“that the difference of races was strictly preserved, and that the *Periœki* were always considered as *Achæans*”—I find no proof, and I believe it to be erroneous. Respecting *Pharis*, *Geronthræ*, and *Amyklæ*, three *Periœkic* towns, Pausanias gives us to understand that the pre-existing inhabitants were expelled some long time after the Dorian conquest, and that a Dorian population replaced them.³ Without placing great faith in this statement, for which Pausanias could hardly have any good authority, we may yet accept it as

¹ Dr. Arnold (in his Dissertation on the Spartan Constitution, appended to the first volume of his *Thucydides*, p. 643) places greater confidence in the historical value of this narrative of *Isokratês* than I am inclined to do. On the other hand, Sir G. C. Lewis, in his Review of Dr. Arnold's Dissertation (*Philological Museum*, vol. ii. p. 45), considers the “account of *Isokratês* as completely inconsistent with that of Ephorus;” which is saying rather more, perhaps, than the tenor of the two strictly warrants. In Sir G. Lewis's excellent article, most of the difficult points respecting the Spartan constitution will be found raised and discussed in a manner highly instructive.

Another point in the statement of *Isokratês* is, that the Dorians at the time of the original conquest of Laconia were only 2000 in number (*Or. xii. Parnath. p. 286*). Mr. Clinton rejects this

estimate as too small, and observes, “I suspect that *Isokratês*, in describing the numbers of the Dorians at the original conquest, has adapted to the description the actual numbers of the Spartans in his own time” (*Fast. Hellen. ii. p. 408*).

This seems to me a probable conjecture, and it illustrates as well the absence of data under which *Isokratês* or his informants laboured, as the method which they took to supply the deficiency.

² Schömann, *Antiq. Jurisp. Græcorum*, iv. 1, 5, p. 112.

³ Pausan. iii. 2, 6; iii. 22, 5. The statement of Müller is to be found (*History of the Dorians*, iii. 2, 1); he quotes a passage of Pausanias which is noway to the point.

Sir G. C. Lewis (*Philolog. Mus. ut sup. p. 41*) is of the same opinion as Müller.

representing the probabilities of the case and as counterbalancing the unsupported hypothesis of Müller. The Periœkic townships were probably composed either of Dorians entirely, or of Dorians incorporated in greater or less proportion with the pre-existing inhabitants. But whatever difference of race there may once have been, it was effaced before the historical times,¹ during which we find no proof of Achæans, known as such, in Laconia. The Herakleids, the Ægeids, and the Talthybiads, all of whom belong to Sparta, seem to be the only examples of separate races (partially distinguishable from Dorians) known after the beginning of authentic history. The Spartans and the Periœki constitute one political aggregate, and that too so completely melted together in the general opinion (speaking of the times before the battle of Leuktra), that the peace of Antalkidas, which guaranteed autonomy to every separate Grecian city, was never so construed as to divorce the Periœkic towns from Sparta. Both are known as Laconians or Lacedæmonians, and Sparta is regarded by Herodotus only as the first and bravest among the many and brave Lacedæmonian cities.² The victors at Olympia are proclaimed not as Spartans, but as Laconians,—a title alike

¹ M. Kopstadt (in the learned Dissertation which I have before alluded to, *De Rerum Laconicarum Constitutionis Lycurgæ Origine et Indole*, cap. ii, p. 31) controverts this position respecting the Periœki. He appears to understand it in a sense which my words hardly present—at least a sense which I did not intend them to present: as if the majority of inhabitants in *each* of the hundred Periœkic towns were Dorians—"ut per centum Laconia oppida distributi *ubique* majorem incolarum numerum efficerent" (p. 32). I meant only to affirm that some of the Periœkic towns, such as Amyklæ, were wholly or almost wholly, Dorian; many others of them partially Dorian. But what may have been the comparative numbers (probably different in each town) of Dorian and non-Dorian inhabitants—there are no means of determining. M. Kopstadt (p. 35) admits that Amyklæ, Pharis, and Geronthræ, were Periœkic towns peopled by Dorians; and if this be true, it negatives the general maxim on the faith of which he contradicts what I affirm: his maxim is—"nunquam Dorienses à Doriensibus, nisi bello victi erant, civitate æquoque jure privati sunt" (p. 31). It is unsafe to lay down such large positions respecting a

supposed uniformity of Dorian rules and practice. The high authority of O. Müller has been misleading in this respect.

It is plain that Herodotus (compare his expression, viii. 73 and i. 145) conceived all the free inhabitants of Laconia not as Achæans, but as Dorians. He believes in the story of the legend, that the Achæans, driven out of Laconia by the invading Dorians and Herakleidæ, occupied the territory in the north-west of Peloponnesus which was afterwards called Achaia,—expelling from it the Ionians. Whatever may be the truth about this legendary statement—and whatever may have been the original proportions of Dorians and Achæans in Laconia—these two races had (in the fifth century B.C.) become confounded in one undistinguishable ethnical and political aggregate called Laconian or Lacedæmonian—comprising both Spartans and Periœki, though with very unequal political franchises and very material differences in individual training and habits. The case was different in Thessaly, where the Thessalians held in dependence Magnètes, Perrhæbi, and Achæans: the separate nationality of these latter was never lost.

² Herod. vii. 234.

borne by the Periæki. And many of the numerous winners whose names we read in the Olympic lists as Laconians, may probably have belonged to Amyklæ or other Periækic towns.

The Periækic hoplites constituted always a large—in later times a preponderant—numerical proportion of the Lacedæmonian army, and must undoubtedly have been trained, more or less perfectly, in the peculiar military tactics of Sparta; since they were called upon to obey the same orders as the Spartans in the field,¹ and to perform the same evolutions. Some cases appear, though rare, in which a Periækus has high command in a foreign expedition. In the time of Aristotle, the larger proportion of Laconia (then meaning only the country eastward of Taygetus, since the foundation of Messênê by Epaminondas had been consummated) belong to Spartan citizens,² but the remaining smaller half must have been the property of the Periæki, who must besides have carried on most of the commerce of export and import—the metallurgic enterprise, and the distribution of internal produce—which the territory exhibited; since no Spartan ever meddled in such occupations. And thus the peculiar training of Lykurgus, by throwing all these employments into the hands of the Periæki, opened to them a new source of importance which the dependent townships of Argos, of Thebes, or of Orchomenus, would not enjoy.

The Helots of Laconia were Coloni or serfs bound to the soil, who tilled it for the benefit of the Spartan proprietors certainly—probably, of Periækic proprietors also. They were the rustic

¹ Thucyd. viii. 6–22. They did not however partake in the Lykurgæan discipline; but they seem to be named *οἱ ἐκ τῆς χώρας παῖδες* as contrasted with *οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἀγωγῆς* (Sosibius ap. Athenæ. xv. p. 674).

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 23. *διὰ γὰρ τὸ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν εἶναι τὴν πλείστην γῆν, οὐκ ἐξετάζουσιν ἀλλήλων τὰς εἰσφοράς.*

Sir G. C. Lewis, in the article above alluded to (Philolog. Mus. ii. p. 54), says about the Periæki:—"They lived in the country or in small towns of the Laconian territory, and cultivated the land, which they did not hold of any individual citizen, but paid for it a tribute or rent to the state; being exactly in the same condition as the *possessores* of the Roman domain, or the Ryots in Hindostan before the introduction of the Permanent Settlement." It may be doubted, I think, whether the Periæki paid any such rent or tribute as that which Sir G. Lewis here supposes. The

passage just cited from Aristotle seems to show that they paid direct taxation individually, and just upon the same principle as the Spartan citizens, who are distinguished only by being larger landed proprietors. But though the principle of taxation be the same, there was practical injustice (according to Aristotle) in the mode of assessing it. "The Spartan citizens (he observes) being the largest landed-proprietors, take care not to canvass strictly *each other's payment of property-tax*"—i. e. they wink mutually at each other's evasions. If the Spartans had been the *only* persons who paid *εἰσφορά* or property-tax, this observation of Aristotle would have had no meaning. In principle, the tax was assessed both on their larger properties, and on the smaller properties of the Periæki: in practice, the Spartans helped each other to evade the due proportion.

population of the country, who dwelt, not in towns, but either in small villages¹ or in detached farms, both in the district immediately surrounding Sparta, and round the Periœkic Laconian towns also. Of course there were also Helots who lived in Sparta and other towns, and did the work of domestic slaves—but such was not the general character of the class. We cannot doubt that the Dorian conquest from Sparta found this class in the condition of villagers and detached rustics; but whether they were dependent upon pre-existing Achæan proprietors, or independent like much of the Arcadian village population, is a question which we cannot answer. In either case, however, it is easy to conceive that the village lands (with the cultivators upon them) were the most easy to appropriate for the benefit of masters resident at Sparta; while the towns, with the district immediately around them, furnished both dwelling and maintenance to the outgoing detachments of Dorians. If the Spartans had succeeded in their attempt to enlarge their territory by the conquest of Arcadia,² they might very probably have converted Tegea and Mantinea into Periœkic towns, with a diminished territory inhabited (either wholly or in part) by Dorian settlers—while they would have made over to proprietors in Sparta much of the village lands of the Mænalii, Azanes, and Parrhasii, helotising the inhabitants. The distinction between a town and a village population seems the main ground of the different treatment of Helots and Periœki in Laconia. A considerable proportion of the Helots were of genuine Dorian race, being the Dorian Messenians west of Mount Taygetus, subsequently conquered and aggregated to this class of dependent cultivators, who, as a class, must have begun to exist from the very first establishment of the invading Dorians in the district round Sparta. From whence the name of Helots arose we do not clearly make out: Ephorus deduced it from the town of Helus, on the southern coast, which the Spartans are said to have taken after a resistance so obstinate as to provoke them to deal very rigorously with the captives. There are many reasons for rejecting this story, and another etymology has been proposed according to which Helot is synonymous with *captive*: this is more plausible, yet still not convincing.³ The Helots lived

They were serfs—adscripti glebæ—their condition and treatment.

¹ The village-character of the Helots is distinctly marked by Livy, xxxiv. 27, in describing the inflictions of the despot Nabis :—"Ilotarum quidam (hi sunt jam inde antiquitus *castellani*, agreste genus) transfugere voluisse insimulati, per om-

nes *vicos* sub verberibus acti necantur."

² Herodot. i. 66. ἐχρηστηρίάζοντο ἐν Δέλφοισι ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀρκάδων χώρῃ.

³ See O. Müller, Dorians, iii. 3, 1; Ephorus ap. Strabo. viii. p. 365; Harpocration, v. Ἐλωτες.

in the rural villages as *adscripti glebæ*, cultivating their lands and paying over their rent to the master at Sparta, but enjoying their homes, wives, families, and mutual neighbourly feelings apart from the master's view. They were never sold out of the country, and probably never sold at all; belonging not so much to the master as to the state, which constantly called upon them for military service, and recompensed their bravery or activity with a grant of freedom. Meno the Thessalian of Pharsalus took out three hundred Penestæ of his own to aid the Athenians against Amphipolis: these Thessalian Penestæ were in many points analogous to the Helots, but no individual Spartan possessed the like power over the latter. The Helots were thus a part of the state, having their domestic and social sympathies developed, a certain power of acquiring property,¹ and the consciousness of Grecian lineage and dialect—points of marked superiority over the foreigners who formed the slave population of Athens or Chios. They seem to have been noway inferior to any village population of Greece; while the Grecian observer sympathised with them more strongly than with the bought slaves of other states—not to mention that their homogeneous aspect, their numbers, and their employment in military service, rendered them more conspicuous to the eye.

The service in the Spartan house was all performed by members of the Helot class; for there seem to have been few, if any, other slaves in the country. The various anecdotes which are told respecting their treatment at Sparta betoken less of cruelty than of ostentatious scorn²—a sentiment which we are noway surprised to discover among the citizens at the mess-table. But the great mass of the Helots, who dwelt in the country, were objects of a very different sentiment on the part of the Spartan ephors, who knew their bravery, energy, and standing discontent, and yet were forced to employ them as an essential portion of the state army. The Helots commonly served as light-armed, in which capacity the Spartan hoplites could not dispense with their attendance. At the battle of Plataea, every Spartan hoplite had seven Helots,³ and every Peri-

¹ Kleomenes III. offered manumission to every Helot who could pay down five Attic minæ: he was in great immediate want of money, and he raised by this means 500 talents. Six thousand Helots must thus have been in a condition to find five minæ each, which was a very considerable sum (Plutarch, Kleomenes, c. 23).

² Such is the statement that Helots were compelled to appear in a state of

drunkenness, in order to excite in the youths a sentiment of repugnance against intoxication (Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 28; also *Adversus Stoicos de Commun. Notit.* c. 19, p. 1067).

³ Herod. ix. 29. The Spartans at Thermopylæ seem to have been attended each by only one Helot (vii. 229).

O. Müller seems to consider that the light-armed who attended the Perioæic hoplites at Plataea were *not* Helots (Dor.

œkic hoplite one Helot to attend him:¹ but even in camp, the Spartan arrangements were framed to guard against any sudden mutiny of these light-armed companions, while at home, the citizen habitually kept his shield disjoined from its holding-ring to prevent the possibility of its being snatched for the like purpose. Sometimes select Helots were clothed in heavy armour, and thus served in the ranks, receiving manumission from the state as the reward of distinguished bravery.²

Bravery and energy of the Helots—fear and cruelty of the Spartans.

But Sparta, even at the maximum of her power, was more than once endangered by the reality, and always beset with the apprehension, of Helotic revolt. To prevent or suppress it, the ephors submitted to insert express stipulations for aid in their treaties with Athens—to invite Athenian troops into the heart of Laconia—and to practise combinations of cunning and atrocity which even yet stand without parallel in the long list of precautions for fortifying unjust dominion. It was in the eighth year of the Peloponnesian war, after the Helots had been called upon for signal military efforts in various ways, and when the Athenians and Messenians were in possession of Pylus, that the ephors felt especially apprehensive of an outbreak. Anxious to single out the most forward and daring Helots, as the men from whom they had most to dread, they issued proclamation that every member of that class who had rendered distinguished services should make his claims known at Sparta, promising liberty to the most deserving. A large number of Helots came forward to claim the boon: not less than 2000 of them were approved, formally manumitted, and led in solemn procession round the temples, with garlands on their heads, as an inauguration to their coming life of freedom. But the treacherous garland only marked them out as victims for the sacrifice: every man of them forthwith disappeared,—the manner of their death was an untold mystery.

For this dark and bloody deed Thucydidēs is our witness,³ and

iii. 3, 6). Herodotus does not distinctly say that they were so, but I see no reason for admitting two different classes of light-armed in the Spartan military force.

The calculation which Müller gives of the number of Periœki and Helots altogether proceeds upon very untrustworthy data. Among them is to be noticed his supposition that πολιτική χώρα means the district of Sparta as distinguished from Laconia, which is contrary to the passage in Polybius (vi.

45); πολιτική χώρα in Polybius means the territory of the state generally.

¹ Xenophon, Rep. Lac. c. 12, 4; Kri-tias, De Lacedæm. Repub. ap. Libanium, Orat. de Servitute, t. ii. p. 85, Reisk. ὡς ἀπιστίας εἶνεκα τῆς πρὸς τοὺς Εἰλωτας ἐξαιρεῖ μὲν Σπαρτιατῆς οἰκοὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος τὴν πόρπακα, &c.

² Thucyd. i. 101; iv. 80; v. 14-23.

³ Thucyd. iv. 80. οἱ δὲ οὐ πολλῶ ὕστερον ἠφάνισάν τε αὐτοὺς, καὶ οὐδεὶς ᾔσθετο ὅτ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκαστος διεφθάρη.

Thucydidês describing a contemporary matter into which he had inquired. Upon any less evidence we should have hesitated to believe the statement; but standing as it thus does above all suspicion, it speaks volumes as to the inhuman character of the Lacedæmonian government, while it lays open to us at the same time the intensity of their fears from the Helots. In the assassination of this fated regiment of brave men, a large number of auxiliaries and instruments must have been concerned: yet Thucydidês with all his inquiries could not find out how any of them perished: he tells us, that no man knew. We see here a fact which demonstrates unequivocally the impenetrable mystery in which the proceedings of the Spartan government were wrapped,—the absence not only of public discussion, but of public curiosity,—and the perfection with which the ephors reigned over the will, the hands, and the tongues, of their Spartan subjects. The Venetian Council of Ten, with all the facilities for nocturnal drowning which their city presented, could hardly have accomplished so vast a *coup d'état* with such invisible means. And we may judge from hence, even if we had no other evidence, how little the habits of a public assembly could have suited either the temper of mind, or the march of government, at Sparta.

Evidence of
the character
of the Spar-
tan govern-
ment.

Other proceedings, ascribed to the ephors against the Helots, are conceived in the same spirit as the incident just recounted from Thucydidês, though they do not carry with them the same certain attestation. It was a part of the institutions of Lykurgus (according to a statement which Plutarch professes to have borrowed from Aristotle) that the ephors should every year declare war against the Helots, in order that the murder of them might be rendered innocent; and that active young Spartans should be armed with daggers and sent about Laconia, in order that they might, either in solitude or at night, assassinate such of the Helots as were considered formidable.¹ This last measure passes by the name of the Krypteia, yet we find some difficulty in determining to what extent it was ever realised. That the ephors, indeed, would not be restrained by any scruples of justice or humanity, is plainly shown by the murder of the 2000 Helots above noticed. But this latter incident really answered its purpose; while a standing practice such as that of the Krypteia, and a formal notice of war given before hand, would provoke the reaction of despair rather than enforce tranquillity. There seems indeed good evidence

The
Krypteia.

¹ Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 28; Heraclides Pontic. p. 504, ed. Crag.

that the Krypteia was a real practice,¹—that the ephors kept up a system of police or espionage throughout Laconia by the employment of active young citizens, who lived a hard and solitary life, and suffered their motions to be as little detected as possible. The ephors might naturally enough take this method of keeping watch both over the Periœkic townships and the Helot villages, and the assassination of individual Helots by these policemen or Krypts would probably pass unnoticed. But it is impossible to believe in any standing murderous order, or deliberate annual assassination of Helots, for the purpose of intimidation, as Aristotle is alleged to have represented—for we may well doubt whether he really did make such a representation, when we see that he takes no notice of this measure in his Politics, where he speaks at some length both of the Spartan constitution and of the Helots. The well-known hatred and fear, entertained by the Spartans towards their Helots, has probably coloured Plutarch's description of the Krypteia, so as to exaggerate those unpunished murders which occasionally happened, into a constant phænomenon with express design. A similar deduction is to be made from the statement of Myrôn of Priênê,² who alleged that they were beaten every year without any special fault, in order to put them in mind of their slavery—and that those Helots, whose superior beauty or stature placed them above the visible stamp of their condition, were put to death; whilst such masters as neglected to keep down the spirit of their vigorous Helots were punished. That secrecy, for which the ephors were so remarkable, seems enough of itself to refute the assertion that they publicly proclaimed war against the Helots; though we may well believe that this unhappy class of men may have been noticed as objects for jealous observation in the annual ephoric oath of office. Whatever may have been the treatment of the Helots in later times, it is at all events hardly to be supposed that any regulation hostile to them can have emanated from Lykurgus. For the dangers arising from that source did not become serious until after the Messenian war—nor indeed until after the gradual diminution of the number of Spartan citizens had made itself felt.

The manumitted Helots did not pass into the class of Periœki, —for this purpose a special grant, of the freedom of some Periœkic township, would probably be required,—but

¹ Plato, Legg. i. p. 633: the words of the Lacedæmonian Megillus designate an existing Spartan custom. Compare the same treatise, vi. p. 763, where Ast suspects, without reason, the genuine-

ness of the word *κρυπτοί*.

² Myron, ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 657. *ἐπικόπτειν τοὺς ἀδρουμένους* does not strictly or necessarily mean "to put to death."

constituted a class apart, known at the time of the Peloponnesian war by the name of Neodamôdes. Being persons who had earned their liberty by signal bravery, they were of course regarded by the ephors with peculiar apprehension, and if possible, employed on foreign service,¹ or planted on some foreign soil as settlers. In what manner these freedmen employed themselves, we find no distinct information; but we can hardly doubt that they quitted the Helot village and field, together with the rural costume (the leather cap and sheep-skin) which the Helot commonly wore, and the change of which exposed him to suspicion, if not to punishment, from his jealous masters. Probably they, as well as the disfranchised Spartan citizens (called Hypomeiones or Inferiors), became congregated at Sparta, and found employment either in various trades or in the service of the government.

It has been necessary to give this short sketch of the orders of men who inhabited Laconia, in order to enable us to understand the statements given about the legislation of Economical and social regulations ascribed to Lykurgus. Lykurgus. The arrangements ascribed to that lawgiver, in the way that Plutarch describes them, presuppose, and do not create, the three orders of Spartans, Periœki, and Helots. We are told by Plutarch that the disorders which Lykurgus found existing in the state arose in a great measure from the gross inequality of property, and from the luxurious indulgence and unprincipled rapacity of the rich—who had drawn to themselves the greater portion of the lands in the country, leaving a large body of poor, without any lot of land, in hopeless misery and degradation. To this inequality (according to Plutarch) the reforming legislator applied at once a stringent remedy. He redistributed the whole territory belonging to Sparta, as well as the remainder of Laconia; Partition of lands. the former in 9000 equal lots, one to each Spartan citizen; the latter in 30,000 equal lots, one to each Periœkus: of this alleged distribution I shall speak farther presently. Moreover he banished the use of gold and silver money, tolerating nothing in the shape of circulating medium but pieces of iron, heavy and scarcely portable; and he forbade² to the Spartan citizen every species of industrious or money-seeking occupation, agriculture included. He farther constituted—though not without strenuous opposition, during the course of which his eye is said to have been knocked out by a violent youth, named Alkander—the Syssitia or public mess. A certain number of joint tables were provided, and

¹ Thucyd. v. 34.² Xenophon, Rep. Lac. c. 7.

every citizen was required to belong to some one of them and habitually to take his meals at it¹—no new member being Syssitia or public mess. admissible without a unanimous ballot in his favour by the previous occupants. Each provided from his lot of land a specified quota of barley-meal, wine, cheese and figs, and a small contribution of money for condiments: game was obtained in addition by hunting in the public forests of the state, while every one who sacrificed to the gods,² sent to his mess-table a part of the victim killed. From boyhood to old age, every Spartan citizen took his sober meals at this public mess, where all shared alike; nor was distinction of any kind allowed, except on signal occasions of service rendered by an individual to the state.

These public Syssitia, under the management of the Polemarchs, were connected with the military distribution, the con- Public training or discipline. stant gymnastic training, and the rigorous discipline of detail, enforced by Lykurgus. From the early age of seven years, throughout his whole life, as youth and man no less than as boy, the Spartan citizen lived habitually in public, always either himself under drill, gymnastic and military, or a critic and spectator of others—always under the fetters and observances of a rule partly military, partly monastic—estranged from the independence of a separate home—seeing his wife, during the first years after marriage, only by stealth, and maintaining little peculiar relation with his children. The supervision not only of his fellow-citizens, but also of authorised censors or captains nominated by the state, was perpetually acting upon him: his day was passed in public exercises and meals, his nights in the public barrack to which he belonged. Besides the particular military drill, whereby the complicated movements, required from a body of Lacedæmonian hoplites in the field, were made familiar to him from his youth—he also became subject to severe bodily discipline of other kinds, calculated to impart strength, activity, and endurance. To manifest a daring and pugnacious spirit—to sustain the greatest bodily torture unmoved—to endure hunger and thirst, heat, cold and fatigue—to tread the worst ground barefoot, to wear the same garment winter and summer—to suppress external manifestations of feeling, and to exhibit in public, when action was not called for, a bearing shy, silent, and motionless as a statue—all these were the virtues of the accomplished Spartan youth.³ Two squadrons were often

¹ Plutarch, Lykurg. c. 15; substantially confirmed by Xenophon, Rep. Lac. c. 1, 5.

² See the authors quoted in Athenæus, iv. p. 141.

³ Xenoph. Rep. Lac. 2-3, 3-5, 4-6.

matched against each other to contend (without arms) in the little insular circumscription called the *Platanistûs*, and these contests were carried on, under the eye of the authorities, with the utmost extremity of fury. Nor was the competition among them less obstinate, to bear without murmur the cruel scourgings inflicted before the altar of *Artemis Orthia*, supposed to be highly acceptable to the goddess, though they sometimes terminated even in the death of the uncomplaining sufferer.¹ Besides the various descriptions of gymnastic contests, the youths were instructed in the choric dances employed in festivals of the gods, which contributed to impart to them methodized and harmonious movements. Hunting in the woods and mountains of *Laconia* was encouraged, as a means of inuring them to fatigue and privation. The nourishment supplied to the youthful Spartans was purposely kept insufficient, but they were allowed to make up the deficiency not only by hunting, but even by stealing whatever they could lay hands upon, provided they could do so without being detected in the fact; in which latter case they were severely chastised.² In reference simply to bodily

The extreme pains taken to enforce *καρτεία* (fortitude and endurance, in the Spartan system is especially dwelt upon by Aristotle (*Politica*, ii. 6, 5-16); compare Plato, *De Legibus*, i. p. 633; Xenophon, *De Laced. Repub.* ii. 9—with the references in Schneider's note—likewise Cragius, *de Republica Laced.* iii. 8. p. 325.

¹ It is remarkable that these violent contentions of the youth, wherein kicking, biting, gouging out each other's eyes, was resorted to—as well as the *διαμαρτύριος* or scourging-match before the altar of *Artemis*—lasted down to the closing days of *Sparta*, and were actually seen by Cicero, Plutarch, and even Pausanias. Plutarch had seen several persons die under the suffering (Plutarch, *Lykurg.* c. 16, 18-30; and *Instituta Laconica*, p. 239; Pausan. iii. 14, 9, 16, 7; Cicero, *Tuscul. Disp.* ii. 15).

The voluntary tortures, undergone by the young men among the *Mandan* tribe of Indians at their annual religious festival, in the presence of the elders of the tribe, —afford a striking illustration of the same principles and tendencies as this Spartan *διαμαρτύριος*. They are endured partly under the influence of religious feelings, as an acceptable offering to the Great Spirit—partly as a point of emulation and glory on the

part of the young men, to show themselves worthy and unconquerable in the eyes of their seniors. The intensity of these tortures is indeed frightful to read, and far surpasses in that respect anything ever witnessed at *Sparta*. It would be incredible, were it not attested by a trustworthy eye-witness.

See Mr. Catlin's *Letters on the North American Indians*, Letter 22, vol. i. p. 157 *seqq.*

"These religious ceremonies are held, in part, for the purpose of conducting all the young men of the tribe, as they annually arrive at manhood, through an ordeal of privation and torture; which, while it is supposed to harden their muscles and prepare them for extreme endurance—enables the chiefs who are spectators of the scene, to decide upon their comparative bodily strength and ability, to endure the extreme privations and sufferings that often fall to the lot of Indian warriors; and that they may decide who is the most hardy and best able to lead a war-party in case of emergency."—Again, p. 173, &c.

The *καρτεία* or power of endurance (*Aristot. Pol.* ii. 6, 5-16) which formed one of the prominent objects of the *Lycurgean* training, dwindles into nothing compared to that of the *Mandan* Indians.

² Xenophon, *Anab.* iv. 6, 14; and *De Repub. Lac.* c. 2, 6; *Isokratês*, *Or.* xii.

results,¹ the training at Sparta was excellent, combining strength and agility with universal aptitude and endurance, and steering clear of that mistake by which Thebes and other cities impaired the effect of their gymnastics—the attempt to create an athletic habit, suited for the games, but suited for nothing else.

Of all the attributes of this remarkable community, there is none more difficult to make out clearly than the condition and character of the Spartan women. Aristotle asserts that in his time they were imperious and unruly, without being really so brave and useful in moments of danger as other Grecian females;² that they possessed great influence over the men, and even exercised much ascendancy over the course of public affairs; and that nearly half the landed property of Laconia had come to belong to them. The exemption of the women from all control formed, in his eye, a pointed contrast with the rigorous discipline imposed upon the men, – and a contrast hardly less pointed with the condition of women in other Grecian cities, where they were habitually confined to the interior of the house, and seldom appeared in public. While the Spartan husband went through the hard details of his ascetic life, and dined on the plainest fare at the Pheidition or mess, the wife (it appears) maintained an ample and luxurious establishment at home, and the desire to provide for such outlay was one of the causes of that love of money which prevailed among men forbidden to enjoy it in the ordinary ways. To explain this antithesis between the treatment of the two sexes at Sparta, Aristotle was informed that Lykurgus had tried to bring the women no less than the men under a system of discipline, but that they made so obstinate a resistance as to compel him to desist.³

The view here given by the philosopher, and deserving of course

(Panath.) p. 277. It is these licensed expeditions for thieving, I presume, to which Isokratēs alludes when he speaks of τῆς παίδων αὐτονομίας at Sparta, which in its natural sense would be the reverse of the truth (p. 277).

¹ Aristotel. Polit. viii. 3, 3—the remark is curious—γυνὴν μὲν οὖν αἱ μάλιστα δοκοῦσαι τῶν πόλεων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν παίδων αἱ μὲν ἀθλητικὴν ἔξιν ἐμποιοῦσι, λωβώμεναι τὰ τ' εἶδη καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν τῶν σωματίων· οἱ δὲ Λάκωνες ταύτην μὲν οὐχ ἡμαρτον τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, &c. Compare the remark in Plato, Protagor. p. 342.

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 5; Plutarch, Agesilaus, c. 31. Aristotle alludes to the conduct of the Spartan women on

the occasion of the invasion of Laconia by the Thebans, as an evidence of his opinion respecting their want of courage. His judgement in this respect seems hard upon them, and he probably had formed to himself exaggerated notions of what their courage under such circumstances ought to have been, as the result of their peculiar training. We may add that their violent demonstrations on that trying occasion may well have arisen quite as much from the agony of wounded honour as from fear, when we consider what an event the appearance of a conquering enemy near Sparta was.

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 5, 8, 11.

careful attention, is not easy to reconcile with that of Xenophon and Plutarch, who look upon the Spartan women from a different side, and represent them as worthy and homogeneous companions to the men. The Lykurgæan system (as these authors describe it), considering the women as a part of the state, and not as a part of the house, placed them under training hardly less than the men. Its grand purpose, the maintenance of a vigorous breed of citizens, determined both the treatment of the younger women, and the regulations as to the intercourse of the sexes. "Female slaves are good enough (Lykurgus thought) to sit at home spinning and weaving—but who can expect a splendid offspring, the appropriate mission and duty of a free Spartan woman towards her country, from mothers brought up in such occupations?"¹ Pursuant to these views, the Spartan damsels underwent a bodily training analogous to that of the Spartan youth—being formally exercised, and contending with each other in running, wrestling and boxing, agreeably to the forms of the Grecian agônes. They seem to have worn a light tunic, cut open at the skirts, so as to leave the limbs both free and exposed to view—hence Plutarch speaks of them as completely uncovered, while other critics in different quarters of Greece heaped similar reproach upon the practice, as if it had been perfect nakedness.² The presence of the Spartan youths, and even of the kings and the body of citizens, at these exercises, lent animation to the scene. In like manner, the young women marched in the religious processions, sung and danced at particular festivals, and witnessed as spectators the exercises and contentions of the youths; so that the two sexes were perpetually intermingled with each other in public, in a way foreign to the habits, as well as repugnant to the feelings, of other Grecian states. We may well conceive that such an education imparted to the women both a demonstrative character and an eager interest in masculine accomplishments, so that the expression of their praise was the strongest stimulus, and that of their reproach the bitterest humiliation, to the youthful troop who heard it.

The age of marriage (which in some of the unrestricted cities of

¹ Xenoph. Rep. Lac. i. 3-4; Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 12-14.

² Eurip. Androm. 598; Cicero, Tuscul. Quæst. ii. 15. The epithet *παυρομυρδης*, as old as the poet Ibykus, shows that the Spartan women were not uncovered (see Julius Pollux, vii. 55).

It is scarcely worth while, to notice

the poetical allusions of Ovid and Propertius.

How completely the practice of gymnastic and military training for young women, analogous to that of the other sex, was approved by Plato, may be seen from the injunctions in his Republic.

Greece was so early as to deteriorate visibly the breed of citizens)¹ was deferred by the Spartan law, both in women and men, until the period supposed to be most consistent with the perfection of the offspring. And when we read the restriction which Spartan custom imposed upon the intercourse even between married persons, we shall conclude without hesitation that the public intermixture of the sexes in the way just described led to no such liberties, between persons not married, as might be likely to arise from it under other circumstances.² Marriage was almost universal among the citizens, enforced by general opinion at least, if not by law. The young Spartan carried away his bride by a simulated abduction, but she still seems, for some time at least, to have continued to reside with her family, visiting her husband in his barrack in the disguise of male attire and on short and stolen occasions.³ To some married couples, according to Plutarch, it happened, that they had been married long enough to have two or three children, while they had scarcely seen each other apart by daylight. Secret intrigue on the part of married women was unknown at Sparta; but to bring together the finest couples was regarded by the citizens as desirable, and by the lawgiver as a duty. No personal feeling or jealousy on the part of the husband found sympathy from any one—and he permitted without difficulty, sometimes actively encouraged, compliances on the part of his wife consistent with this generally acknowledged object. So far was such toleration carried, that there were some married women who were recognised mistresses of two houses,⁴ and mothers of two distinct families,—a sort of bigamy strictly forbidden to the men, and never permitted except in the remarkable case of king Anaxandrides, when the royal Herakleidan line of Eurysthenes was in danger of becoming extinct. The wife of Anaxandrides being childless, the ephors strongly urged him, on grounds of public necessity, to repudiate her and marry another.

¹ Aristot. Polit. vii. 14, 4.

² "It is certain (observes Dr. Thirlwall, speaking of the Spartan unmarried women) that in this respect the Spartan morals were as pure as those of any ancient, perhaps of any modern, people." (History of Greece, ch. viii. vol. i. p. 371.)

³ Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 15; Xenoph. Rep. Lac. i. 5. Xenophon does not make any allusion to the abduction as a general custom. There occurred cases in which it was real and violent: see Herod. v. 65. Demaratus carried off

and married the betrothed bride of Leotyichides.

⁴ Xenoph. Rep. Lac. i. 9. Εἰ δέ τις αὖ γυναικὶ μὲν συνοικεῖν μὴ βούλοιοτο, τέκνων δὲ ἀξιολόγων ἐπιθυμοίη, καὶ τοῦτο νόμον ἐποίησεν, ἥντινα ἂν εὐτεκνον καὶ γενναῖαν ὀρώη, πείσαντα τὸν ἔχοντα, ἐκ ταύτης τεκνοποιεῖσθαι. Καὶ πολλὰ μὲν τοιαῦτα συνεχῶρει. Αἱ γὰρ γυναικες δίττους οἴκους βούλονται κατέχειν, οἳ τε ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὺς τοῖς παισὶ προσλαμβάνειν, οἱ τοῦ μὲν γένους καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως κοινωνοῦσι, τῶν δὲ χρημάτων οὐκ ἀντιποιοῦνται.

But he refused to dismiss a wife who had given him no cause of complaint; upon which, when they found him inexorable, they desired him to retain her, but to marry another wife besides, in order that at any rate there might be issue to the Eurystheneid line. "He thus (says Herodotus) married two wives, and inhabited two family-hearths, a proceeding unknown at Sparta;"¹ yet the same privilege which, according to Xenophon, some Spartan women enjoyed without reproach from any one, and with perfect harmony between the inmates of both their houses. O. Müller² remarks—and the evidence, as far as we know it, bears him out—that love-marriages and genuine affection towards a wife were more familiar to Sparta than to Athens; though in the former, marital jealousy was a sentiment neither indulged nor recognised—while in the latter, it was intense and universal.³

To reconcile the careful gymnastic training, which Xenophon and Plutarch mention, with that uncontrolled luxury and relaxation which Aristotle condemns in the Spartan women, we may perhaps suppose, that in the time of the latter the women of high position and wealth had contrived to emancipate themselves from the general obligation, and that it is of such particular cases that he chiefly speaks. He dwells especially upon the increasing tendency to accumulate property in the hands of the women,⁴ which seems to have been still more conspicuous a century afterwards in the reign of Agis III. And we may readily imagine that one of the employments of wealth thus acquired would be to purchase exemption from laborious training,—an object more easy to accomplish in their case than in that of the men, whose services were required by the state as soldiers. By what steps so large a proportion as two-fifths of the landed property of the state came to be possessed by women, he partially explains to us. There were (he says) many sole heiresses,—the dowries given by fathers to their daughters were very large,—and the father had unlimited power of testamentary bequest, which he was disposed to use to the advantage of his

Number of
rich women
in the time
of Aristotle
—they had
probably
procured
exemption
from the
general
training.

¹ Herodot. v. 39-40. *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, γυναικας ἔχων δύο, διξās ιστίας οἴκεε, ποιέων οὐδομα Σπαρτιητικά.*

² Müller, Hist. of Dorians, iv. 4, 1. The stories recounted by Plutarch (Agis, c. 20; Kleomenēs, c. 37-38) of the conduct of Agesistrata and Kratesikleia, the wives of Agis and Kleomenēs, and of the wife of Panteus (whom he does not name) on occasion of the deaths of

their respective husbands, illustrate powerfully the strong conjugal affection of a Spartan woman, and her devoted adherence and fortitude in sharing with her husband the last extremities of suffering.

³ See the Oration of Lysias, De Cæde Eratosthenis, Orat. i. p. 94 seq.

⁴ Plutarch, Agis, c. 4.

daughter over his son. Perfect equality of bequest or inheritance between the two sexes, without any preference for females, would accomplish a great deal : but besides this, we are told by Aristotle that there was in the Spartan mind a peculiar sympathy and yielding disposition towards women, which he ascribes to the warlike temper both of the citizen and of the state—Arês bearing the yoke of Aphroditê.¹ But apart from such a consideration, if we suppose on the part of a wealthy Spartan father the simple disposition to treat sons and daughters alike as to bequest,—nearly one half of the inherited mass of property would naturally be found in the hands of the daughters, since on an average of families the number of the two sexes born is nearly equal. In most societies, it is the men who make new acquisitions : but this seldom or never happened with Spartan men, who disdained all money-getting occupations.

Xenophon, a warm panegyrist of Spartan manners, points with some pride to the tall and vigorous breed of citizens which the Lykurgic institutions had produced. The beauty of the Lacedæmonian women was notorious throughout Greece, and Lampitô, the Lacedæmonian woman introduced in the *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes, is made to receive from the Athenian women the loudest compliments upon her fine shape and masculine vigour.² We may remark that, on this as well as on the other points, Xenophon emphatically insists on the peculiarity of Spartan institutions, contradicting thus the views of those who regard them merely as something a little Hyper-Dorian. Indeed such peculiarity seems never to have been questioned in antiquity, either by the enemies or by the admirers of Sparta. And those who censured the public masculine exercises of the Spartan maidens, as well as the liberty tolerated in married women, allowed at the same time that the feelings of both were actively identified with the state to a degree hardly known in Greece ; that the patriotism of the men greatly depended upon the sympathy of the other sex, which manifested itself publicly, in a manner not compatible with the recluse life of Grecian women generally, to the exaltation of the brave as well as to the abasement of the recreant ; and that the dignified bearing of the Spartan matrons under private family loss seriously assisted the state in the task of bearing up against public reverses. “ Return either with your shield or upon it,” was their exhortation

Earnest and lofty patriotism of the Spartan women.

¹ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 6 ; Plutarch, Agis, c. 4. τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους κατηκόους ὄντας αἰὲ τῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ πλεῖον ἐκεῖ-
 ναις τῶν δημοσίων, ἢ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῖς, πολυπραγμανεῖν δίδοντας.

² Aristophan. *Lysistr.* 80.

to their sons when departing for foreign service: and after the fatal day of Leuktra, those mothers who had to welcome home their surviving sons in dishonour and defeat, were the bitter sufferers; while those whose sons had perished, maintained a bearing comparatively cheerful.¹

Such were the leading points of the memorable Spartan discipline, strengthened in its effect on the mind by the absence of communication with strangers. For no Spartan could go abroad without leave, nor were strangers permitted to stay at Sparta; they came thither, it seems, by a sort of sufferance, but the uncourteous process called *xenêlasy*² was always available to remove them, nor could there arise in Sparta that class of resident metics or aliens who constituted a large part of the population of Athens, and seem to have been found in most other Grecian towns. It is in this universal schooling, training and drilling, imposed alike upon boys and men, youths and virgins, rich and poor, that the distinctive attribute of Sparta is to be sought—not in her laws or political constitution.

Lykurgus (or the individual to whom this system is owing, whoever he was) is the founder of a warlike brotherhood rather than the lawgiver of a political community; his brethren live together like bees in a hive (to borrow a simile from Plutarch), with all their feelings implicated in the commonwealth, and divorced from house and home.³ Far from contemplating the society as a whole, with its multifarious wants and liabilities, he interdicts beforehand, by one of the three primitive *Rhetræ*, all written laws, that is to say, all formal and premeditated enactments on any special subject. When disputes are to be settled or judicial interference is required, the magistrate is to decide from his own sense of equity; that the magistrate will not depart from the established customs and recognized purposes of the city, is presumed from the personal discipline which he and the select body to whom he belongs, have undergone. It is

Lykurgus is the trainer of a military brotherhood, more than the framers of a political constitution.

¹ See the remarkable account in Xenophon, *Hellen.* iv. 16; Plutarch, *Agésilæus*, c. 29; one of the most striking incidents in Grecian history. Compare also the string of sayings ascribed to Lacedæmonian women, in Plutarch, *Lac. Apophth.* p. 241 *seq.*

² How offensive the Lacedæmonian *xenêlasy* or expulsion of strangers appeared in Greece, we may see from the speeches of Periklès in Thucydides (i.

144; ii. 39). Compare Xenophon, *Rep. Lac.* xiv. 4; Plutarch, *Agis*, c. 10; Lykurgus, c. 27; Plato, *Protagoras*, p. 348.

No Spartan left the country without permission: *Isokratès*, *Orat.* xi. (Buaris), p. 225; Xenoph. *ut sup.*

Both these regulations became much relaxed after the close of the Peloponnesian war.

³ Plutarch, *Lykurg.* c. 25.

this select body, maintained by the labour of others, over whom Lykurgus exclusively watches, with the provident eye of a trainer, for the purpose of disciplining them into a state of regimental preparation,¹ single minded obedience, and bodily efficiency and endurance, so that they may be always fit and ready for defence, for conquest and for dominion. The parallel of the Lykurgian institutions is to be found in the Republic of Plato, who approves the Spartan principle of select guardians carefully trained and administering the community at discretion; with this momentous difference indeed, that the Spartan character² formed by Lykurgus is of a low type, rendered savage and fierce by exclusive and overdone bodily discipline,—destitute even of the elements of letters,—immersed in their own narrow specialities, and taught to despise all that lay beyond,—possessing all the qualities requisite to procure dominion, but none of those calculated to render dominion popular or salutary to the subject; while the habits and attributes of the guardians, as shadowed forth by Plato, are enlarged as well as philanthropic, qualifying them not simply to govern, but to govern for purposes protective, conciliatory and exalted. Both Plato and Aristotle conceive as the perfection of society something of the Spartan type—a select body of equally privileged citizens, disengaged from industrious pursuits, and subjected to public and uniform training. Both admit (with Lykurgus) that the citizen belongs neither to himself nor to his family, but to his city; both at the same time note with regret, that the Spartan training was turned only to one portion of human virtue—that which is called forth in a state of war;³ the citizens being converted into a sort of

¹ Plutarch observes justly about Sparta under the discipline of Lykurgus, that it was “not the polity of a city, but the life of a trained and skilful man”—ὁ πόλεως ἢ Σπάρτη πολιτεία, ἀλλ’ ἀνδρὸς ἀσκητοῦ καὶ σοφοῦ βίον ἔχουσα (Plutarch, Lyk. c. 30).

About the perfect habit of obedience at Sparta, see Xenophon, Memorab. iii. 5, 9, 15—iv. 4, 15, the grand attributes of Sparta in the eyes of its admirers (Isokratēs, Panathen. Or. xii. p. 256-278), *πειθαρχία* — *σωφροσύνη* — *τὰ γυμνάσια* *ταῖς καθεστῶτα καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀσκήσιν τῆς ἀνδρίας καὶ πρὸς τὴν δμόνοιαν καὶ συνόλως τὴν περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἐμπειρίαν*.

² Aristot. Polit. viii. 3, 3. Οἱ Λάκωνες . . . θηριώδεις ἀπεργάζονται τοῖς πόνοις.

That the Spartans were absolutely ignorant of letters, and could not read,

is expressly stated by Isokratēs (Panathen. Or. xii. p. 277), οὔτοι δὲ τοσούτον ἀπολελειμμένοι τῆς κοινῆς παιδείας καὶ φιλοσοφίας εἶσιν, ὥστ’ οὐδὲ γράμματα μαθάνουσιν, &c.

The preference of rhetoric to accuracy is so manifest in Isokratēs, that we ought to understand his expressions with some reserve; but in this case it is evident that he means literally what he says, for in another part of the same discourse there is an expression dropt almost unconsciously which confirms it. “The most rational Spartans (he says) will appreciate this discourse, if they find any one to read it to them—*ἢν λάβωσι τὸν ἀναγνώσκοντα* (p. 235).

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 22; vii. 13, 11; viii. 1, 3; viii. 3, 3. Plato, Legg. i. p. 626-629. Plutarch, Solôn, c. 22.

garrison, always under drill, and always ready to be called forth either against Helots at home or against enemies abroad. Such exclusive tendency will appear less astonishing if we consider the very early and insecure period at which the Lykurgian institutions arose, when none of those guarantees which afterwards maintained the peace of the Hellenic world had as yet become effective—no constant habits of intercourse, no custom of meeting in Amphiktyony from the distant parts of Greece, no common or largely frequented festivals, no multiplication of proxenies (or standing tickets of hospitality) between the important cities, no pacific or industrious habits anywhere. When we contemplate the general insecurity of Grecian life in the ninth or eighth century before the Christian æra, and especially the precarious condition of a small band of Dorian conquerors, in Sparta and its district, with subdued Helots on their own lands and Achæans unsubdued all around them—we shall not be surprised that the language which Brasidas in the Peloponnesian war addresses to his army in reference to the original Spartan settlement, was still more powerfully present to the mind of Lykurgus four centuries earlier—"We are a few in the midst of many enemies; we can only maintain ourselves by fighting and conquering."¹

Under such circumstances, the exclusive aim which Lykurgus proposed to himself is easily understood; but what is truly surprising, is the violence of his means and the success of the result. He realised his project of creating in the 8000 or 9000 Spartan citizens unrivalled habits of obedience, hardihood, self-denial, and military aptitude—complete subjection on the part of each individual to the local public opinion, and preference of death to the abandonment of Spartan maxims—intense ambition on the part of every one to distinguish himself within the prescribed sphere of duties, with little ambition for anything else. In what manner so rigorous a system of individual training can have been first brought to bear upon any community, mastering the course of the thoughts and actions from boyhood to old age—a work far more difficult than any political revolution—we are not permitted to discover. Nor does even the influence of an earnest and energetic Herakleid man—seconded by the still more powerful working of the Delphian god behind, upon the strong pious sus-

His end, exclusively warlike—his means, exclusively severe.

¹ Thucyd. iv. 126. Οἱ γε μηδὲ ἀπὸ πολιτειῶν τοιούτων ἤκετε, ἐν αἷς οὐ πολλοὶ ὀλίγων ἔρχουσι, ἀλλὰ πλείωνων μᾶλλον ἐλάσσους· οὐκ ἄλλω τι κτησάμενοι τὴν δυναστείαν ἢ τῷ μαχόμενοι κρατεῖν.

The most remarkable circumstance is, that these words are addressed by Brasidas to an army composed in large proportion of manumitted Helots (Thucyd. iv. 81).

ceptibilities of the Spartan mind—sufficiently explain a phænomenon so remarkable in the history of mankind, unless we suppose them aided by some combination of co-operating circumstances which history has not transmitted to us,¹ and preceded by disorders so exaggerated as to render the citizens glad to escape from them at any price.

Respecting the ante-Lycurgean Sparta we possess no positive information whatever. But although this unfortunate gap cannot be filled up, we may yet master the negative probabilities of the case, sufficiently to see that in what Plutarch has told us (and from Plutarch the modern views have, until lately, been derived), there is indeed a basis of reality, but there is also a large superstructure of romance,—in not a few particulars essentially misleading. For example, Plutarch treats Lykurgus as introducing his reforms at a time when Sparta was mistress of Laconia, and distributing the whole of that territory among the Periœki. Now we know that Laconia was not then in possession of Sparta, and that the partition of Lykurgus (assuming it to be real) could only have been applied to the land in the immediate vicinity of the latter. For even Amyklæ, Pharis and Geronthræ were not conquered until the reign of Tëleklus, posterior to any period which we can reasonably assign to Lykurgus: nor can any such distribution of Laconia have really occurred. Farther we are told that Lykurgus banished from Sparta coined gold and silver, useless professions and frivolities, eager pursuit of gain, and ostentatious display. Without dwelling upon the improbability that any one of these anti-Spartan characteristics should have existed at so early a period as the ninth century before the Christian æra, we may at least be certain that coined silver was not then to be found, since it was first introduced into Greece by Pheidôn of Argos in the succeeding century, as has been stated in the preceding section.

But amongst all the points stated by Plutarch, the most suspicious by far, and the most misleading, because endless calculations have been built upon it, is the alleged redivision of landed property. He tells us that Lykurgus found fearful inequality in the landed possessions of the Spartans; nearly all the land in the hands of a few, and a great multitude without any land; that he rectified this evil by a redivision of the Spartan district into 9000 equal

Statements
of Plutarch
about Ly-
kurgus —
much ro-
mance in
them.

New par-
tition of
lands — no
such measure
ascribed to
Lykurgus
by earlier
authors
down to
Aristotle.

¹ Plato treats the system of Lykurgus as emanating from the Delphian Apollo, and Lykurgus as his missionary (Legg. i. p. 632).

lots, and the rest of Laconia into 30,000, giving to each citizen as much as would produce a given quota of barley, &c. ; and that he wished moreover to have divided the moveable property upon similar principles of equality, but was deterred by the difficulties of carrying his design into execution.

Now we shall find on consideration that this new and equal partition of lands by Lykurgus is still more at variance with fact and probability than the two former alleged proceedings. All the historical evidences exhibit decided inequalities of property among the Spartans—inequalities which tended constantly to increase ; moreover, the earlier authors do not conceive this evil as having grown up by way of abuse out of a primæval system of perfect equality, nor do they know anything of the original equal redivision by Lykurgus. Even as early as the poet Alkæus (B.C. 600-580) we find bitter complaints of the oppressive ascendancy of wealth, and the degradation of the poor man, cited as having been pronounced by Aristodêmus at Sparta : “Wealth (said he) makes the man—no poor person is either accounted good or honoured.”¹ Next, the historian Hellanikus certainly knew nothing of the Lykurgian redivision—for he ascribed the whole Spartan polity to Eurysthenês and Proklês, the original founders, and hardly noticed Lykurgus at all. Again, in the brief but impressive description of the Spartan lawgiver by Herodotus, several other institutions are alluded to, but nothing is said about a redivision of the lands ; and this latter point is in itself of such transcendent moment, and was so recognised among all Grecian thinkers, that the omission is almost a demonstration of ignorance. Thucydidês certainly could not have believed that equality of property was an original feature of the Lykurgian system ; for he says that at Lacedæmon “the rich men assimilated themselves greatly in respect of clothing and general habits of life to the simplicity of the poor, and thus set an example which was partially followed in the rest of Greece :” a remark which both implies the existence of unequal property, and gives a just appreciation of the real working of Lykurgic institutions.² The like is the sentiment of Xenophon :³ he observes that

¹ Alcæi Fragment. 41. p. 279, ed. Schneidewin :—

Ὅς γὰρ δή ποτ' Ἀριστόδαμον φαισ' οὐκ ἀπα-
λαμνον ἐν Σπαρτῇ λόγον
Εἰπὴν—Χρήματ' ἀνὴρ πεινχρὸς δ' οὐδεὶς
πέλει· ἐσθλὸς οὐδὲ τίμιος.

Compare the Schol. ad Pindar. Isthm.

ii. 17, and Diogen. Laërt. i. 31.

² Thucyd. i. 6. μετρία δ' αὖ ἐσθῆτι
καὶ ἐς τὸν νῦν τρόπον πρῶτοι Λακεδαιμό-
νιοι ἐχρήσαντο, καὶ ἐς τὰ ἄλλα πρὸς τοὺς
πολλοὺς οἱ τὰ μείζω κεκτημένοι ἰσοδαῖοι
μάλιστα κατέστησαν. See also Plutarch,
Apophtegm. Lacon. p. 210. A.—F.

³ Xenophon. Republ. Laced. c. 7.

the rich at Sparta gained little by their wealth in point of superior comfort; but he never glances at any original measure carried into effect by Lykurgus for equalising possessions. Plato too,¹ while he touches upon the great advantage possessed by the Dorians, immediately after their conquest of Peloponnesus, in being able to apportion land suitably to all—never hints that this original distribution had degenerated into an abuse, and that an entire subsequent redivision had been resorted to by Lykurgus: moreover, he is himself deeply sensible of the hazards of that formidable proceeding. Lastly, Aristotle clearly did not believe that Lykurgus had redivided the soil. For he informs us, first, that “both in Lacedæmon and in Krete, the legislator had rendered the enjoyment of property common through the establishment of the Syssitia or public mess.”² Now this remark (if read in the chapter of which it forms part, a refutation of the scheme of Communism for the select guardians in the Platonic Republic) will be seen to tell little for its point, if we assume that Lykurgus at the same time equalised all individual possessions. Had Aristotle known that fact, he could not have failed to notice it: nor could he have assimilated the legislators in Lacedæmon and Krete, seeing that in the latter no one pretends that any such equalisation was ever brought about. Next, not only does Aristotle dwell upon the actual inequality of property at Sparta as a serious public evil, but he nowhere treats this as having grown out of a system of absolute equality once enacted by the lawgiver as a part of the primitive constitution: he expressly notices inequality of property so far back as the second Messenian war. Moreover, in that valuable chapter of his Politics where the scheme of equality of possessions is discussed, Phaleas of Chalkedôn is expressly mentioned as the first author of it, thus indirectly excluding Lykurgus.³

¹ Plato, Legg. iii. p. 684.

² Aristotel. Politic. ii. 2, 10. *Ἵσπερ τὰ περὶ τὰς κτήσεις ἐν Λακεδαιμονίῳ καὶ Κρήτῃ τοῖς συσσιτίοις ὁ νομοθέτης ἐκόινωσε.*

³ Aristot. Politic. ii. 4, 1. about Phaleas; and about Sparta and Krete, generally, the whole sixth and seventh chapters of the second book; also v. 6. 2-7.

Theophrastus (apud Plutarch. Lycurg. c. 10) makes a similar observation, that the public mess, and the general simplicity of habits, tended to render wealth of little service to the possessor: *τὸν πλοῦτον ἔπλουτον ἀπεργάσασθαι τῇ κοινότητι τῶν δειπνων, καὶ τῇ περὶ τὴν διαί-*

ταν εὐτελείᾳ. Compare Plutarch, Apophthegm. Lacon. p. 226 E. The wealth therefore was not formally done away with in the opinion of Theophrastus: there was no positive equality of possessions.

Both the Spartan kings dined at the public mess at the same pheditio (Plutarch, Agesilaus, c. 30).

Herakleidēs Ponticus mentions nothing either about equality of Spartan lots or fresh partition of lands by Lykurgus (ad calcem Cragii, De Spartanorum Repub. p. 504), though he speaks about the Spartan lots and law of succession as well as about Lykurgus.

The mere silence of Aristotle is in this discussion a negative argument of the greatest weight. Isokratês¹ too speaks much about Sparta for good and for evil—mentions Lykurgus as having established a political constitution much like that of the earliest days of Athens—praises the gymnasia and the discipline, and compliments the Spartans upon the many centuries which they have gone through without violent sedition, extinction of debts and redivision of the land—those “monstrous evils” as he terms them. Had he conceived Lykurgus as being himself the author of a complete redivision of land, he could hardly have avoided some allusion to it.

It appears then that none of the authors down to Aristotle ascribe to Lykurgus a redivision of the lands, either of Sparta or of Laconia. The statement to this effect in Plutarch, given in great detail and with precise specification of number and produce, must have been borrowed from some author later than Aristotle; and I think we may trace the source of it, when we study Plutarch's biography of Lykurgus in conjunction with that of Agis and Kleomenês. The statement is taken from authors of the century after Aristotle, either in, or shortly before, the age when both those kings tried extreme measures to renovate the sinking state: the former by a thorough change of system and property, yet proposed and accepted according to constitutional forms; the latter by projects substantially similar, with violence to enforce them. The accumulation of lauded property in few hands, the multiplication of poor, and the decline in the number of citizens, which are depicted as grave mischiefs by Aristotle, had become greatly aggravated during the century between him and Agis. The number of citizens, reckoned by Herodotus in the time of the Persian invasion at 8000, had dwindled down in the time of Aristotle to 1000, and in that of Agis to 700, out of which latter number 100 alone possessed most of the landed property of the state.² Now by the ancient rule of Lykurgus, the qualification for citizenship was the ability to furnish the prescribed quota, incumbent on each individual, at the public mess: so soon as a citizen became too poor to answer to this requisition, he lost his franchise and his eligibility to offices.³ The smaller lots of land, though it was held discredit-

The idea of Lykurgus as an equal partitioner of lands belongs to the century of Agis and Kleomenês.

¹ Isokratês, Panathen. Or. xii. pp. 266, 270, 278: οὐδὲ χρεῶν ἀποκοπὰς οὐδὲ γῆς ἀναδασμὸν οὐδ' ἄλλ' οὐδέν τῶν ἀνηκέστων κακῶν.

² Plutarch, Agis, c. iv.

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 21. Παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Λακῶσιν ἕκαστον δεῖ φέρειν, καὶ σφόδρα πενήτων ἐνίων ὄντων, καὶ τοῦτο

able either to buy or sell them,¹ and though some have asserted (without ground I think) that it was forbidden to divide them—became insufficient for numerous families, and seem to have been alienated in some indirect manner to the rich; while every industrious occupation being both interdicted to a Spartan citizen

Circumstances of Sparta down to the reign of Agis.

and really inconsistent with his rigorous personal discipline, no other means of furnishing his quota, except the lot of land, was open to him. The difficulty felt with regard to these smaller lots of land may be judged of from the fact stated by Polybius,² that three or four Spartan brothers had

τὸ ἀνάλωμα οὐ δυνάμενον δαπανᾶν
"Ὅρος δὲ τῆς πολιτείας οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πατριος, τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον τοῦτο τὸ τέλος φέρειν, μὴ μετέχειν αὐτῆς. So also Xenophon, Rep. Lac. c. vii. ἴσα μὲν φέρειν εἰς τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, ὁμοίως δὲ δαιτῆσθαι τάξας.

The existence of this rate-paying qualification is the capital fact in the history of the Spartan constitution; especially when we couple it with the other fact, that no Spartan acquired anything by any kind of industry.

¹ Herakleides Ponticus, ad calcem Cragii de Repub. Laced. p. 504. Compare Cragius, iii. 2, p. 196.

Aristotle (ii. 6, 10) states that it was discreditable to buy or sell a lot of land, but that the lot might be either given or bequeathed at pleasure. He mentions nothing about the prohibition to divide, and he even states what contradicts it,—that it was the practice to give a large dowry when a rich man's daughter married (ii. 6, 11). The sister of Agesilaus, Kyniska, was a person of large property, which apparently implies the division of his father's estate (Plutarch, Agesilaus, 30).

Whether there was ever any law prohibiting a father from dividing his lot among his children may well be doubted. The Rhethra of the ephor Epitadeus (Plutarch, Agis, 5) granted unlimited power of testamentary disposition to the possessor, so that he might give away or bequeath his land to a stranger if he chose. To this law great effects are ascribed: but it is evident that the tendency to accumulate property in few hands, and the tendency to diminution in the number of qualified citizens, were powerfully manifested before the time of Epitadeus, who came after Lysander. Plutarch in another place notices Hesiod, Xenokratēs and Lykurgus, as hav-

ing concurred with Plato in thinking that it was proper to leave only one single heir (ἓνα μόνον κληρόνομον καταλιπεῖν) (Ἵπομνήματα εἰς Ἡσίοδον, Fragm. vol. v. pp. 777, Wytttenb.). But Hesiod does not lay down this as a necessity or as a universal rule; he only says that a man is better off who has only one son (Opp. Di. 374). And if Plato had been able to cite Lykurgus as an authority for that system of an invariable number of separate κλήροι or lots, which he sets forth in his treatise De Legibus (p. 740), it is highly probable that he would have done so. Still less can Aristotle have supposed that Lykurgus or the Spartan system either ensured, or intended to ensure, the maintenance of an unalterable number of distinct proprietary lots; for he expressly notices that scheme as a peculiarity of Philolaus the Corinthian, in his laws for the Thebans (Polit. ii. 9, 7).

² Polybius, Fragm. ap. Maii. Collect. Vett. Scrip. vol. ii. p. 384.

Perhaps, as O. Müller remarks, this may mean only, that none except the eldest brother could afford to marry; but the feelings of the Spartans in respect to marriage were in many other points so different from ours, that we are hardly authorised to reject the literal statement (History of the Dorians, iii. 10, 2)—which indeed is both illustrated and rendered credible by the permission granted in the laws of Solon to an ἐπίκληρος who had been claimed in marriage by a relative in his old age—ἂν ὁ κρατῶν καὶ κύριος γεγωνὺς κατὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτὸς μὴ δυνατὸς ἢ πλησιάζειν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγγιστὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὀνύεσθαι (Plutarch, Solon, c. 20).

I may observe, that of O. Müller's statements respecting the lots of land at Sparta, several are unsupported and some incorrect.

often one and the same wife, the paternal land being just sufficient to furnish contributions for all to the public mess, and thus to keep alive the citizen-rights of all the sons. The tendency to diminution in the number of Spartan citizens seems to have gone on uninterruptedly from the time of the Persian war, and must have been aggravated by the foundation of Messênê, with its independent territory around, after the battle of Leuktra, an event which robbed the Spartans of a large portion of their property. Apart from these special causes, moreover, it has been observed often as a statistical fact, that a close corporation of citizens, or any small number of families, intermarrying habitually among one another, and not reinforced from without, have usually a tendency to diminish.

The present is not the occasion to enter at length into that combination of causes which partly sapped, partly overthrew, both the institutions of Lykurgus and the power of Sparta. But taking the condition of that city as it stood in the time of Agis III. (say about 250 B.C.), we know that its citizens had become few in number, the bulk of them miserably poor, and all the land in a small number of hands. The old discipline and the public mess (as far as the rich were concerned) had degenerated into mere forms—a numerous body of strangers or non-citizens (the old *xenêlasy*, or prohibition of resident strangers, being long discontinued) were domiciled in the town, forming a powerful moneyed interest; and lastly, the dignity and ascendancy of the state amongst its neighbours were altogether ruined. It was insupportable to a young enthusiast like king Agis, as well as to many ardent spirits among his contemporaries, to contrast this degradation with the previous glories of their country; nor did they see any other way of reconstructing the old Sparta except by again admitting the disfranchised poor citizens, redividing the lands, cancelling all debts, and restoring the public mess and military training in all their strictness. Agis endeavoured to carry through these subversive measures, (such as no demagogue in the extreme democracy of Athens would ever have ventured to glance at,) with the consent of the senate and public assembly, and the acquiescence of the rich. His sincerity is attested by the fact, that his own property, and that of his female relatives, among the largest in the state, was cast as the first sacrifice into the common stock. But he became the dupe of unprincipled coadjutors, and perished in the unavailing attempt to realise his scheme by persuasion. His suc-

Diminished number of citizens and degradation of Sparta in the reign of Agis. His ardent wish to restore the dignity of the state.

cessor Kleomenês afterwards accomplished by violence a change substantially similar, though the intervention of foreign arms speedily overthrew both himself and his institutions.

Now it was under the state of public feeling which gave birth to these projects of Agis and Kleomenês at Sparta, that the historic fancy of Lykurgus as an equal partitioner of lands grew out of this feeling. much such a belief would favour the schemes of innovation is too obvious to require notice; and without supposing any deliberate imposture, we cannot be astonished that the predispositions of enthusiastic patriots interpreted according to their own partialities an old unrecorded legislation from which they were separated by more than five centuries. The Lykurgian discipline tended forcibly to suggest to men's minds the *idea* of equality among the citizens,—that is, the negation of all inequality not founded on some personal attribute—inasmuch as it assimilated the habits, enjoyments and capacities of the rich to those of the poor; and the equality thus existing in idea and tendency, which seemed to proclaim the wish of the founder, was strained by the later reformers into a positive institution which he had at first realised, but from which his degenerate followers had receded. It was thus that the fancies, longings, and indirect suggestions of the present assumed the character of recollections out of the early, obscure, and extinct historical past. Perhaps the philosopher Sphærus of Borysthenês (friend and companion of Kleomenês,¹ disciple of Zeno the Stoic and author of works now lost both on Lykurgus and Sokratês and on the constitution of Sparta) may have been one of those who gave currency to such an hypothesis. And we shall readily believe, that if advanced, it would find easy

¹ Plutarch, Kleomenês, cap. 2–11, with the note of Schömann, p. 175; also Lycurg. cap. 8; Athenæ. iv. p. 141.

Phylarchus also described the proceedings of Kleomenês, seemingly with favour (Athenæ. ib.); compare Plutarch, Agis, c. 9.

Polybius believed that Lykurgus had introduced equality of landed possession both in the district of Sparta and throughout Laconia: his opinion is probably borrowed from these same authors, of the third century before the Christian æra. For he expresses his great surprise how the best-informed ancient authors (οἱ λογιώτατοι τῶν ἀρχαίων συγ-

γραφῶν), Plato, Xenophon, Ephorus, Kallisthenês, can compare the Kretan polity to the old Lacedæmonian, the main features of the two being (as he says) so different—equality of property at Sparta, great inequality of property in Krete, among other differences (Polyb. vi. 45–48).

This remark of Polybius exhibits the difference of opinion of the earlier writers, as compared with those during the third century before the Christian æra. The former compared Spartan and Kretan institutions, because they did not conceive equality of landed property as a feature in old Sparta.

and sincere credence, when we recollect how many similar delusions have obtained vogue in modern times far more favourable to historical accuracy—how much false colouring has been attached by the political feeling of recent days to matters of ancient history, such as the Saxon Witenagemote, the Great Charter, the rise and growth of the English House of Commons, or even the Poor Law of Elizabeth.

When we read the division of lands really proposed by king Agis, it is found to be a very close copy of the original Partition proposed by Agis. division ascribed to Lykurgus. He parcels the lands bounded by the four limits of Pellênê, Sellasia, Malea, and Taygetus, into 4500 lots, one to every Spartan; and the lands beyond these limits into 15,000 lots, one to each Periœkus; and he proposes to constitute in Sparta fifteen Pheiditia or public mess-tables, some including 400 individuals, others 200,—thus providing a place for each of his 4500 Spartans. With respect to the division originally ascribed to Lykurgus, different accounts were given. Some considered it to have set out 9000 lots for the district of Sparta, and 30,000 for the rest of Laconia;¹ others affirmed that 6000 lots had been given by Lykurgus, and 3000 added afterwards by king Polydorus; a third tale was, that Lykurgus had assigned 4500 lots, and king Polydorus as many more. This last scheme is much the same as what was really proposed by Agis.

In the preceding argument respecting the redivision of land ascribed to Lykurgus, I have taken that measure as it is described by Plutarch. But there has been a tendency, in some able modern writers, while admitting the general fact of such redivision, to reject the account given by Plutarch in some of its main circumstances. That, for instance, which is the capital feature in Plutarch's narrative, and which gives soul and meaning to his picture of the law-giver—the equality of partition—is now rejected by many as incorrect, and it is supposed that Lykurgus made some new agrarian regulations tending towards a general equality of landed property, but not an entirely new partition; that he may have resumed from the wealthy men lands which they had unjustly taken from the conquered Achæans, and thus provided allotments both for the poorer citizens and for the subject Laconians. Such is the opinion of Dr. Thirlwall, who at the same time admits that

Opinion that Lykurgus proposed some agrarian interference, but not an entire repartition, gratuitous and improbable.

¹ Respecting Sphærus, see Plutarch, | iv. p. 141; Diogen. Laërt. vii. sect. |
Lycurg. c. 8; Kleomen. c. 2; Athenæ. | 137.

the exact proportion of the Lykurgæan distribution can hardly be ascertained.¹

I cannot but take a different view of the statement made by Plutarch. The moment that we depart from that rule of equality, which stands so prominently marked in his biography of Lykurgus, we step into a boundless field of possibility, in which there is nothing to determine us to one point more than to another. The surmise started by Dr. Thirlwall, of lands unjustly taken from the conquered Achæans by wealthy Spartan proprietors, is altogether gratuitous; and granting it to be correct, we have still to explain how it happened that this correction of a partial injustice came to be transformed into the comprehensive and systematic measure which Plutarch describes; and to explain, farther, from whence it arose that none of the authors earlier than Plutarch take any notice of Lykurgus as an agrarian equalizer. These two difficulties will still remain, even if we overlook the gratuitous nature of Dr. Thirlwall's supposition, or of any other supposition which

¹ Hist. of Greece, ch. viii. vol. i. p. 344-347.

C. F. Hermann, on the contrary, considers the equal partition of Laconia into lots indivisible and inalienable as "an essential condition" (*eine wesentliche Bedingung*) of the whole Lykurgæan system (*Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer*, sect. 28).

Tittmann (*Griechische Staatsverfassungen*, p. 588-596) states and seems to admit the equal partition as a fact, without any commentary.

Wachsmuth (*Hellenisch. Alterthumskunde*, v. 4, 42, p. 217) supposes "that the best land was already parcelled, before the time of Lykurgus, into lots of equal magnitude, corresponding to the number of Spartans, which number afterwards increased to nine thousand." For this assertion I know no evidence; it departs from Plutarch, without substituting anything better authenticated or more plausible. Wachsmuth notices the partition of Laconia among the Perioeci in 30,000 equal lots, without any comment, and seemingly as if there were no doubt of it (p. 218).

Manso also supposes that there had once been an equal division of land prior to Lykurgus—that it had degenerated into abuse—and that Lykurgus corrected it, restoring, not absolute equality, but something near to equality (*Manso, Sparta*, vol. i. p. 110-121).

This is the same gratuitous supposition as that of Wachsmuth.

O. Müller admits the division as stated by Plutarch, though he says that the whole number of 9000 lots cannot have been set out before the Messenian war; and he adheres to the idea of equality as contained in Plutarch; but he says that the equality consisted in "equal estimate of average produce,"—not in equal acreable dimensions. He goes so far as to tell us that "the lots of the Spartans, which supported twice as many men as the lots of the Perioeci, must upon the whole have been twice as extensive (*i.e.* in the aggregate): each lot must therefore have been seven times greater" (compare *History of the Dorians*, iii. 3, 6; iii. 10, 2). He also supposes that "similar partitions of land had been made from the time of the first occupation of Laconia by the Dorians." Whoever compares his various positions with the evidence brought to support them, will find a painful disproportion between the basis and the superstructure.

The views of Schömann, so far as I collect from expressions somewhat vague, seem to coincide with those of Dr. Thirlwall. He admits however that the alleged Lykurgæan equalisation is at variance with the representations of Plato (*Schömann, Antiq. Jur. Pub.* iv. 1, 7, note 4, p. 116).

can be proposed respecting the real Lykurgian measure which Plutarch is affirmed to have misrepresented.

It appears to me that these difficulties are best obviated by adopting a different canon of historical interpretation. We cannot accept as real the Lykurgian land division described in the life of the lawgiver; but treating this account as a fiction, two modes of proceeding are open to us. We may either consider the fiction, as it now stands, to be the exaggeration and distortion of some small fact, and then try to guess, without any assistance, what the small fact was; or we may regard it as fiction from first to last, the expression of some large idea and sentiment so powerful in its action on men's minds at a given time, as to induce them to make a place for it among the realities of the past. Now the latter supposition, applied to the times of Agis III., best meets the case before us. The eighth chapter of the life of Lykurgus by Plutarch, in recounting the partition of land, describes the dream of king Agis, whose mind is full of two sentiments—grief and shame for the actual condition of his country—together with reverence for its past glories, as well as for the lawgiver from whose institutions those glories had emanated. Absorbed with this double feeling, the reveries of Agis go back to the old ante-Lykurgian Sparta as it stood more than five centuries before. He sees in the spirit the same mischiefs and disorders as those which afflict his waking eye—gross inequalities of property, with a few insolent and luxurious rich, a crowd of mutinous and suffering poor, and nothing but fierce antipathy reigning between the two. Into the midst of this froward, lawless, and distempered community steps the venerable missionary from Delphi,—breathes into men's minds new impulses, and an impatience to shake off the old social and political Adam—and persuades the rich, voluntarily abnegating their temporal advantages, to welcome with satisfaction a new system wherein no distinction shall be recognised, except that of good or evil desert.¹ Having thus regenerated the national mind, he parcels out the territory of Laconia into equal lots, leaving no superiority to any one. Fraternal harmony becomes the reigning sentiment, while the coming harvests present the gratifying spectacle of a paternal

The statement of Plutarch is best explained by supposing it a fiction of the time of Agis.

¹ Plutarch, Lykurg. c. 8. συνέπεισε τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν εἰς μέσον θέντας, ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναδάσασθαι, καὶ ζῆν μετ' ἀλλήλων ἅπαντας, ὁμαλεῖς καὶ ἰσοκλήρους τοῖς βλοῖς γενομένους, τὸ δὲ πρωτεῖον ἀρετῇ μετιόντας· ὥς ἄλλης ἐτέρῳ πρὸς ἕτερον οὐκ οὕσης διαφορᾶς, οὐδ' ἀνισότητος, πλὴν ὅσῃν αἰσχυρῶν ψόγος ὀρίζει καὶ καλῶν ἔπαινος. Ἐπάγων δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἔργον, διένειμε, &c.

inheritance recently distributed, with the brotherhood contented, modest and docile. Such is the picture with which "mischievous Oneirus" cheats the fancy of the patriotic Agis, whispering the treacherous message that the gods have promised *him* success in a similar attempt, and thus seducing him into that fatal revolutionary course, which is destined to bring himself, his wife and his aged mother to the dungeon and the hangman's rope.¹

That the golden dream just described was dreamt by some Spartan patriots is certain, because it stands recorded in Plutarch; that it was not dreamt by the authors of centuries preceding Agis, I have already endeavoured to show; that the earnest feelings, of sickness of the present and yearning for a better future under the colours of a restored past, which filled the soul of this king and his brother reformers—combined with the levelling tendency between rich and poor which really was inherent in the Lykurgian discipline—were amply sufficient to beget such a dream and to procure for it a place among the great deeds of the old lawgiver, so much venerated and so little known,—this too I hold to be unquestionable. Had there been any evidence that Lykurgus had interfered with private property, to the limited extent which Dr. Thirlwall and other able critics imagine—that he had resumed certain lands unjustly taken by the rich from the Achæans—I should have been glad to record it; but finding no such evidence, I cannot think it necessary to presume the fact simply in order to account for the story in Plutarch.²

¹ Plutarch, Agis, c. 19–20.

² I read with much satisfaction in M. Kopstadt's Dissertation, that the general conclusion which I have endeavoured to establish respecting the alleged Lykurgian redivision of property, appears to him successfully proved. (Dissert. De Rerum Laconic. Const. sect. 18. p. 138.)

He supposes, with perfect truth, that at the time when the first edition of these volumes was published, I was ignorant of the fact that Lachmann and Kortüm had both called in question the reality of the Lykurgian redivision. In regard to Professor Kortüm, the fact was first brought to my knowledge by his notice of these two volumes in the *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1846, No. 41. p. 649.

Since the first edition I have read the treatise of Lachmann (*Die Spartanische Staats Verfassung in ihrer Entwicklung und ihrem Verfall*, sect. 10. p. 170)

wherein the redivision ascribed to Lykurgus is canvassed. He too attributes the origin of the tale as a portion of history, to the social and political feelings current in the days of Agis III. and Kleomenês III. He notices also that it is in contradiction with Plato and Isokratês. But a large proportion of the arguments which he brings to disprove it, are connected with ideas of his own respecting the social and political constitution of Sparta, which I think either untrue or uncertified. Moreover he believes in the inalienability as well as the indivisibility of the separate lots of land—which I believe to be just as little correct as their supposed equality.

Kopstadt (p. 139) thinks that I have gone too far in rejecting every middle opinion. He thinks that Lykurgus must have done something, though much less than what is affirmed, tending to realise equality of individual property.

I shall not say that this is impossible.

The various items in that story all hang together, and must be understood as forming parts of the same comprehensive fact, or comprehensive fancy. The fixed total of 9000 Spartan, and 30,000 Laconian lots,¹ the equality between them, and the rent accruing from each, represented by a given quantity of moist and dry produce,—all these particulars are alike true or alike uncertified. Upon the various numbers here given, many authors have raised calculations as to the population and produce of Laconia, which appear to me destitute of any trustworthy foundation. Those who accept the history, that Lykurgus constituted the above-mentioned numbers both of citizens and of lots of land, and that he contemplated the maintenance of both numbers in unchangeable proportion—are perplexed to assign the means whereby this adjustment was kept undisturbed. Nor are they much assisted in the solution of this embarrassing problem by the statement of Plutarch, who tells us that the number remained fixed of itself, and that the succession ran on from father to son without either consolidation or multiplication of parcels, down to the period when foreign wealth flowed into Sparta, as a consequence of the successful conclusion of the Peloponnesian war. Shortly after that period (he tells us) a citizen named Epitadeus became ephor—a vindictive and malignant man, who, having had a quarrel with his son, and wishing to oust him from the succession, introduced and obtained sanction to a new Rhetra, whereby power was granted to every father of a family either to make over during life, or to bequeath after death, his house and his estate to any one whom he chose.² But it is plain that this story (whatever be the truth about the family quarrel of Epitadeus) does not help us out of the difficulty. From the time of Lykurgus to that of this disinheriting ephor, more than four centuries must be reckoned: now had there been real causes at work sufficient to maintain inviolate the identical number of lots and families during this long period, we see no reason why his new law, simply per-

Acknowledged difficulty of understanding by what means the fixed number and integrity of the lots were maintained.

Plutarch's story about the ephor Epitadeus.

If we had ampler evidence, perhaps such facts might appear. But as the evidence stands now, there is nothing whatever to show it. Nor are we entitled (in my judgement) to presume that it was so, in the absence of evidence, simply in order to make out that the Lykurgian myth is only an exaggeration, and not entire fiction.

¹ Aristotle (*Polit.* ii. 6, 11) remarks

that the territory of the Spartans would maintain 1500 horsemen and 30,000 hoplites, while the number of citizens was in point of fact less than 1000. Dr. Thirlwall seems to prefer the reading of Göttling—3000 instead of 30,000; but the latter seems better supported by MSS., and most suitable.

² Plutarch, *Agis*, c. 5.

missive and nothing more, should have overthrown it. We are not told by Plutarch what was the law of succession prior to Epitadeus. If the whole estate went by law to one son in the family, what became of the other sons, to whom industrious acquisition in any shape was repulsive as well as interdicted? If, on the other hand, the estate was divided between the sons equally (as it was by the law of succession at Athens), how can we defend the maintenance of an unchanged aggregate number of parcels?

Dr. Thirlwall, after having admitted a modified interference with private property by Lykurgus, so as to exact from the wealthy a certain sacrifice in order to create lots for the poor, and to bring about something approaching to equi-producing lots for all, observes:—"The average amount of the rent (paid by the cultivating Helots from each lot) seems to have been no more than was required for the frugal maintenance of a family with six persons. The right of transfer was as strictly confined as that of enjoyment: the patrimony was indivisible, inalienable, and descended to the eldest son; in default of a male heir, to the eldest daughter. The object seems to have been, after the number of the allotments became fixed, that each should be constantly represented by one head of a household. But the nature of the means employed for this end is one of the most obscure points of the Spartan system In the better times of the commonwealth, this seems to have been principally effected by adoptions and marriages with heiresses, which provided for the marriages of younger sons in families too numerous to be supported on their own hereditary property. It was then probably seldom necessary for the state to interfere, in order to direct the childless owner of an estate, or the father of a rich heiress, to a proper choice. But as all adoption required the sanction of the kings, and they had also the disposal of the hand of orphan heiresses, there can be little doubt that the magistrate had the power of interposing on such occasions, even in opposition to the wishes of individuals, to relieve poverty and check the accumulation of wealth." (Hist. Gr. ch. 8. vol. i. p. 367.)

I cannot concur in the view which Dr. Thirlwall here takes of the state of property, or the arrangements respecting its transmission, in ancient Sparta. Neither the equal modesty of possession which he supposes, nor the precautions for perpetuating it, can be shown to have ever existed among the pupils of Lykurgus. Our earliest information intimates the existence of rich men at Sparta: the story of king

Landed property was always unequally divided at Sparta;

Aristo and Agêtus, in Herodotus, exhibits to us the latter as a man who cannot be supposed to have had only just "enough to maintain six persons frugally"—while his beautiful wife, whom Aristo coveted and entrapped from him, is expressly described as the daughter of opulent parents. Sperthiês and Bulis the Talthybiads are designated as belonging to a distinguished race, and among the wealthiest men in Sparta.¹ Demaratus was the only king of Sparta, in the days of Herodotus, who had ever gained a chariot victory in the Olympic games; but we know by the case of Lichas during the Peloponnesian war, Evagoras, and others, that private Spartans were equally successful;² and for one Spartan who won the prize, there must of course have been many who bred their horses and started their chariots unsuccessfully. It need hardly be remarked that chariot-competition at Olympia was one of the most significant evidences of a wealthy house: nor were there wanting Spartans who kept horses and dogs without any exclusive view to the games. We know from Xenophon, that at the time of the battle of Leuktra, "the very rich Spartans" provided the horses to be mounted for the state-cavalry.³ These and other proofs, of the existence of rich men at Sparta, are inconsistent with the idea of a body of citizens each possessing what was about enough for the frugal maintenance of six persons, and no more.

As we do not find that such was in practice the state of property in the Spartan community, so neither can we discover that the lawgiver ever tried either to make or to keep it so. What he did was to impose a rigorous public discipline, with simple clothing and fare, incumbent alike upon the rich and the poor (this was his special present to Greece, according to Thucydidês,⁴ and his great point of contact with democracy, according to Aristotle); but he took no pains either to restrain the enrichment of the former, or to prevent the impoverishment of the latter. He meddled little with the distribution of property, and such neglect is one of the capital deficiencies for which Aristotle censures him. That philosopher tells us, indeed, that the Spartan law had made it dishonourable (he does not say, peremptorily forbidden) to buy or sell landed property, but that there was the fullest liberty both of donation and bequest:

¹ Herod. vi. 61. οἷα ἀνθρώπων τε δόλων θυγατέρα, &c.; vii. 134.

² Herod. vi. 70-103; Thucyd. v. 50.

³ Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 4, 11; Xenoph.

de Rep. Lac. v. 3; Molpis ap. Athenæ. iv. p. 141; Aristot. Polit. ii. 2, 5.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 6; Aristot. Polit. iv. 7, 4, 5; viii. 1, 3.

nor were there any laws which tended to equalise it.

and the same results (he justly observes) ensued from the practice tolerated as would have ensued from the practice discountenanced—since it was easy to disguise a real sale under an ostensible donation. He notices pointedly the tendency of property at Sparta to concentrate itself in fewer hands, unopposed by any legal hindrances: the fathers married their daughters to whomsoever they chose, and gave dowries according to their own discretion, generally very large: the rich families moreover inter-married among one another habitually and without restriction. Now all these are indicated by Aristotle as cases in which the law might have interfered, and ought to have interfered, but did not—for the great purpose of disseminating the benefits of landed property as much as possible among the mass of the citizens. Again, he tells us that the law encouraged the multiplication of progeny, and granted exemptions to such citizens as had three or four children—but took no thought how the numerous families of poorer citizens were to live, or to maintain their qualification at the public tables, most of the lands of the state being in the hands of the rich.¹ His notice, and condemnation of that law, which made the franchise of the Spartan citizen dependent upon his continuing to furnish his quota to the public table—has been already adverted to; as well as the potent love of money² which he notes in the Spartan character, and which must have tended continually to keep together the richer families among themselves: while amongst a community where industry was unknown, no poor citizen could ever become rich.

If we duly weigh these evidences, we shall see that equality of possessions neither existed in fact, nor ever entered into the scheme and tendencies of the lawgiver at Sparta. And the picture which Dr. Thirlwall³ has drawn of a body of citizens each possessing a lot of land about

Erroneous
suppositions
with regard
to the
Spartan law
and practice
of succession.

¹ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 10-13; v. 6, 7.

² The panegyrist Xenophon acknowledges much the same respecting the Sparta which he witnessed; but he maintains that it had been better in former times (Repub. Lac. c. 14).

³ The view of Dr. Thirlwall agrees in the main with that of Manso and O. Müller (Manso, Sparta, vol. i. p. 118-128; and vol. ii. Beilage, 9, p. 129; and Müller, History of the Dorians, vol. ii. B. iii. c. 10. sect. 2, 3).

Both these authors maintain the proposition stated by Plutarch (Agis, c. 5, in his reference to the ephor Epitadeus,

and the new law carried by that ephor), that the number of Spartan lots, nearly equal and rigorously indivisible, remained with little or no change from the time of the original division down to the return of Lysander after his victorious close of the Peloponnesian war. Both acknowledge that they cannot understand by what regulations this long unalterability, so improbable in itself, was maintained: but both affirm the fact positively.

The period will be more than 400 years, if the original division be referred to Lykurgus: more than 300 years, if

adequate to the frugal maintenance of six persons—of adoptions and marriages of heiresses arranged with a deliberate view

the 9000 lots are understood to date from the Messenian war.

If this alleged fact be really a fact, it is something almost without a parallel in the history of mankind: and before we consent to believe it, we ought at least to be satisfied that there is considerable show of positive evidence in its favour, and not much against it. But on examining Manso and Müller, it will be seen that not only is there very slender evidence in its favour—there is a decided balance of evidence against it.

The evidence produced to prove the indivisibility of the Spartan lot is a passage of Herakleidēs Ponticus, c. 2 (ad calc. Cragii, p. 504), *πωλεῖν δὲ γῆν Λακεδαιμονίοις αἰσχρὸν νενόμισται—τῆς ἀρχαίας μοίρας ἀνανέμεσθαι (or νενεμήσθαι) οὐδὲν ἔξεστι*. The first portion of this assertion is confirmed by, and probably borrowed from, Aristotle, who says the same thing nearly in the same words: the second portion of the sentence ought, according to all reasonable rules of construction, to be understood with reference to the first part; that is, to the sale of the original lot. "To sell land is held disgraceful among the Lacedæmonians, nor is it permitted to sever off any portion of the original lot," i. e. *for sale*. Herakleidēs is not here speaking of the law of *succession* to property at Lacedæmon, nor can we infer from his words that the whole lot was transmitted entire to one son. No evidence except this very irrelevant sentence is produced by Müller and Manso to justify their positive assertion, that the Spartan lot of land was indivisible in respect to inheritance.

Having thus determined the indivisible transmission of lots to one son of a family, Manso and Müller presume, without any proof, that that son must be the eldest: and Müller proceeds to state something equally unsupported by proof:—"The extent of his rights, however, was perhaps no farther than that he was considered master of the house and property; while the other members of the family had an equal right to the enjoyment of it. . . . The master of the family was therefore obliged to contribute for all these to the *syssitia*, without which contribution no one was admitted."—pp. 199, 200.

All this is completely gratuitous, and

will be found to produce as many difficulties in one way as it removes in another.

The next law as to the transmission of property which Manso states to have prevailed, is, that all daughters were to marry without receiving any dowry—the case of a sole daughter is here excepted. For this proposition he cites Plutarch, Apophtheg. Laconic. p. 227; Justin. iii. 3; Ælian. V. H. vi. 6. These authors do certainly affirm that there was such a regulation, and both Plutarch and Justin assign reasons for it, real or supposed. "Lykurgus being asked why he directed that maidens should be married without dowry, answered,—In order that maidens of poor families might not remain unmarried, and that character and virtue might be exclusively attended to in the choice of a wife." The same general reason is given by Justin. Now the *reason* here given for the prohibition of dowry, goes indirectly to prove that there existed no such law of general succession as that which had been before stated, viz. the sacred indivisibility of the primitive lot. For had this latter been recognised, the reason would have been obvious why daughters could receive no dowry: the father's whole landed property (and a Spartan could have little of any other property, since he never acquired anything by industry) was under the strictest entail to his eldest son. Plutarch and Justin, therefore, while in their statement as to the matter of fact they warrant Manso in affirming the prohibition of dowry (about this matter of fact, more presently), do by the reason which they give, discountenance his former supposition as to the indivisibility of the primitive family lots.

Thirdly, Manso understands Aristotle (Polit. ii. 6, 11), by the use of the adverb *νῦν*, to affirm something respecting his own time specially, and to imply at the same time that the ancient custom had been the reverse. I cannot think that the adverb, as Aristotle uses it in that passage, bears out such a construction: *νῦν δὲ* there does not signify present time as opposed to past, but the antithesis between the actual custom and that which Aristotle pronounces to be expedient. Aristotle gives no indication of being aware that any material change had taken place in the laws of

of providing for the younger children of numerous families—of interference on the part of the kings to ensure this object—of a

succession at Sparta; this is one circumstance, for which both Manso and Müller, who both believe in the extraordinary revolution caused by the permissive law of the ephor Epitadeus, censure him.

Three other positions are laid down by Manso about the laws of property at Sparta. 1. A man might give away or bequeathe his land to whomsoever he pleased. 2. But none except childless persons could do this. 3. They could only give or bequeathe it to citizens who had no land of their own. Of these three regulations, the first is distinctly affirmed by Aristotle, and may be relied upon: the second is a restriction not noticed by Aristotle, and supported by no proof except that which arises out of the story of the ephor Epitadeus, who is said to have been unable to disinherit his son without causing a new law to be passed: the third is a pure fancy.

So much for the positive evidence, on the faith of which Manso and Müller affirm the startling fact, that the lots of land in Sparta remained distinct, indivisible, and unchanged in number, down to the close of the Peloponnesian war. I venture to say that such positive evidence is far too weak to sustain an affirmation in itself so improbable, even if there were no evidence on the other side for contradiction. But in this case there is powerful contradictory evidence.

First, the assertions of these authors are distinctly in the teeth of Aristotle, whose authority they try to invalidate by saying that he spoke altogether with reference to his own time at Sparta, and that he misconceived the primitive Lykurgian constitution. Now this might form a reasonable ground of presumption against the competency of Aristotle, if the witnesses produced on the other side were older than he. But it so happens that *every one* of the witnesses produced by Manso and Müller are *younger* than Aristotle: Herakleidês Ponticus, Plutarch, Justin, Ælian, &c. Nor is it shown that these authors copied from any source earlier than Aristotle—for his testimony cannot be contradicted by any inferences drawn from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Isokratês or Ephorus. None of these writers, anterior to or contemporary with Aristotle, countenance the fancy of

equal, indivisible, perpetual lots, or prohibition of dowry.

The fact is, that Aristotle is not only our best witness, but also our oldest witness, respecting the laws of property in the Spartan commonwealth. I could have wished indeed that earlier testimonies had existed, and I admit that even the most sagacious observer of 340–330 B.C. is liable to mistake when he speaks of one or two centuries before. But if Aristotle is to be discredited on the ground of late date, what are we to say to Plutarch? To insist on the intellectual eminence of Aristotle would be superfluous: and on this subject he is a witness the more valuable, as he had made careful, laborious and personal inquiries into the Grecian governments generally, and that of Sparta among them—the great *point de mire* for ancient speculative politicians.

Now the statements of Aristotle distinctly exclude the idea of equal, indivisible, inalienable, perpetual lots,—and prohibition of dowry. He particularly notices the habit of giving very large dowries, and the constant tendency of the lots of land to become consolidated in fewer and fewer hands. He tells us nothing upon the subject which is not perfectly consistent, intelligible, and uncontradicted by any known statements belonging to his own or to earlier times. But the reason why men refuse to believe him, and either set aside or explain away his evidence, is, that they sit down to study with their minds full of the division of landed property ascribed to Lykurgus by Plutarch. I willingly concede that on this occasion we have to choose between Plutarch and Aristotle. We cannot reconcile them except by arbitrary suppositions, every one of which breaks up the simplicity, beauty and symmetry of Plutarch's agrarian idea—and every one of which still leaves the perpetuity of the original lots unexplained. And I have no hesitation in preferring the authority of Aristotle (which is in perfect consonance with what we indirectly gather from other authors, his contemporaries and predecessors) as a better witness on every ground; rejecting the statement of Plutarch, and rejecting it altogether with all its consequences.

But the authority of Aristotle is not

fixed number of lots of land, each represented by one head of a household—this picture is one, of which the reality must not be sought on the banks of the Eurotas. The “better times of the commonwealth,” to which he refers, may have existed in the glowing retrospect of Agis, but are not acknowledged in the sober appreciation of Aristotle. That the citizens were far more numerous in early times, the philosopher tells us, and that the community had in his day greatly declined in power, we also know: in

the only argument which may be urged to refute this supposition, that the distinct Spartan lots remained unaltered in number down to the time of Lysander. For if the number of distinct lots remained undiminished, the number of citizens cannot have greatly diminished. Now the conspiracy of Kinadôn falls during the life of Lysander, within the first ten years after the close of the Peloponnesian war: and in the account which Xenophon gives of that conspiracy, the paucity of the number of citizens is brought out in the clearest and most emphatic manner. And this must be before the time when the new law of Epitadeus is said to have passed, at least before that law can have had room to produce any sensible effects. If then the ancient 9000 lots still remained all separate, without either consolidation or subdivision, how are we to account for the small number of citizens at the time of the conspiracy of Kinadôn?

This examination of the evidence (for the purpose of which I have been compelled to prolong the present note) shows—1. That the hypothesis of indivisible, inalienable lots, maintained for a long period in undiminished number at Sparta, is not only sustained by the very minimum of affirmative evidence, but is contradicted by very good negative evidence. 2. That the hypothesis which represents dowries to daughters as being prohibited by law, is indeed affirmed by Plutarch, Ælian and Justin, but is contradicted by the better authority of Aristotle.

The recent edition of Herakleidês Ponticus, published by Schneidewin in 1847 since my first edition, presents an amended text which completely bears out my interpretation. His text, derived from a fuller comparison of existing MSS., as well as from better critical judgement (see his Prolegg. c. iii. p. liv.), stands—*Πωλεῖν δὲ γῆν Λακεδαιμονίους αἰσχροὺν νενόμισται τῆς δὲ ἀρχαίας μοῖρας οὐδὲ ἔξεστιν* (p. 7). It is plain that

all this passage relates to sale of land, and not to testation, or succession, or division. Thus much *negatively* is certain, and Schneidewin remarks in his note (p. 53) that it contradicts Müller, Hermann, and Schömann—adding, that the distinction drawn is, between land inherited from the original family lots, and land otherwise acquired, by donation, bequest, &c. Sale of the former was absolutely illegal: sale of the latter was discreditable, yet not absolutely illegal. Aristotle in the Politics (ii. 6, 10) takes no notice of any such distinction, between land inherited from the primitive lots, and land otherwise acquired. Nor was there perhaps any well-defined line of distinction, in a country of unwritten customs like Sparta, between what was simply disgraceful and what was positively illegal. Schneidewin in his note, however, assumes the original equality of the lots as certain in itself, and as being the cause of the prohibition: neither of which appears to me true.

I speak of this confused compilation still under the name of Herakleidês Ponticus, by which it is commonly known; though Schneidewin in the second chapter of his Prolegomena has shown sufficient reason for believing that there is no authority for connecting it with the name of Herakleidês. He tries to establish the work as consisting of Excerpta from the lost treatise of Aristotle's *περὶ Πολιτειῶν*: which is well made out with regard to some parts, but not enough to justify his inference as to the whole. The article, wherein Welcker vindicates the ascribing of the work to an Excerptor of Herakleidês, is unsatisfactory (Kleine Schriften, p. 451).

Beyond this irrelevant passage of Herakleidês Ponticus, no farther evidence is produced by Müller and Manso to justify their positive assertion, that the Spartan lot of land was indivisible in respect to inheritance.

this sense the times of Sparta had doubtless once been better. We may even concede that during the three centuries succeeding Lykurgus, when they were continually acquiring new territory, and when Aristotle had been told that they had occasionally admitted new citizens, so that the aggregate number of citizens had once been 10,000—we may concede that in these previous centuries the distribution of land had been less unequal, so that the disproportion between the great size of the territory and the small number of citizens was not so marked as it had become at the period which the philosopher personally witnessed; for the causes tending to augmented inequality were constant and uninterrupted in their working. But this admission will still leave us far removed from the sketch drawn by Dr. Thirlwall, which depicts the Lykurgian Sparta as starting from a new agrarian scheme not far removed from equality of landed property—the citizens as spontaneously disposed to uphold this equality by giving to unprovided men the benefit of adoptions and heiress-marriages—and the magistrate as interfering to enforce this latter purpose, even in cases where the citizens were themselves unwilling. All our evidence exhibits to us both decided inequality of possessions and inclinations on the part of rich men the reverse of those which Dr. Thirlwall indicates; nor will the powers of interference which he ascribes to the magistrate be found sustained by the chapter of Herodotus on which he seems to rest them.¹

¹ Herod. vi. 57, in enumerating the privileges and perquisites of the kings—δικάζειν δὲ μόνους τοὺς βασιλῆας τόσαδε μούνα πατρούχου τε παρθένου περί, ἐς τὸν ἰκνέεται ἔχειν, ἣν μὴ περὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὴν ἐγγύησῃ· καὶ ὁδῶν δημοσιῶν περί· καὶ ἣν τις θετὸν παῖδα ποιεῖσθαι ἐθέλῃ, βασιλῆων ἐνάντιον ποιεῖσθαι.

It seems curious that πατρούχος πάρθενος should mean a damsel who has *no father* (literally *lucus a non lucendo*); but I suppose that we must accept this upon the authority of Julius Pollux and Timæus. Proceeding on this interpretation, Valckenaer gives the meaning of the passage very justly: “Orbæ nuptias, necdum a patre desponsatæ, si plures sibi vindicarent, fieretque ἡ ἐπίκληρος, ut Athenis loquebantur, ἐπίδικος, Spartæ lis ista dirimebatur a regibus solis.”

Now the judicial function here described is something very different from the language of Dr. Thirlwall, that “the kings had the disposal of the hand of orphan heiresses in cases where the

father had not signified his will.” Such disposal would approach somewhat to that omnipotence which Aristophanês (Vesp. 585) makes old Philokleon claim for the Athenian dikasts (an exaggeration well-calculated to serve the poet’s purpose of making the dikasts appear monsters of caprice and injustice), and would be analogous to the power which English kings enjoyed three centuries ago as feudal guardians over wards. But the language of Herodotus is inconsistent with the idea that the kings *chose* a husband for the orphan heiress. She was claimed as of right by persons in certain degrees of relationship to her. Whether the law about ἀγχιστεία (affinity carrying legal rights) was the same as at Athens we cannot tell; but the question submitted for adjudication, at Sparta to the kings and at Athens to the dikasteries, was certainly the same, agreeably to the above note of Valckenaer—namely, to whom, among the various claimants for the marriage, the best legal title really belonged. It is

To conceive correctly, then, the Lykurgæan system, as far as obscurity and want of evidence will permit, it seems to me that there are two current misconceptions which it is essential to discard. One of these is, that the system included a repartition of landed property, upon principles of exact or approximative equality (distinct from that appropriation which belonged to the Dorian conquest and settlement), and provisions for perpetuating the number of distinct and equal lots. The other is, that it was first brought to bear when the Spartans were masters of all Laconia. The illusions created by the old legend—which depicts Laconia as all one country, and all conquered at one stroke—yet survive after the legend itself has been set aside as bad evidence: we cannot conceive Sparta as subsisting by itself without dominion over Laconia, nor Amyklæ, Pharis and Geronthræ, as really and truly independent of Sparta. Yet, if these towns were independent in the time of Lykurgus, much more confidently may the same independence be affirmed of the portions of Laconia which lie lower than Amyklæ down the valley of the Eurotas, as well as of the eastern coast, which Herodotus expressly states to have been originally connected with Argos.

Discarding then these two suppositions, we have to consider the Lykurgæan system as brought to bear upon Sparta and its immediate circumjacent district, apart from the rest of Laconia, and as not meddling systematically with the partition of property, whatever that may have been, which the Dorian conquerors established at their original settlement. Lykurgus does not try to make the poor rich, nor the rich poor; but he imposes upon both the same subjugating drill¹—the same habits of life, gentlemanlike idleness, and unlettered strength—the same fare, clothing, labours, privations, endurance, punishments, and subordination. It is a lesson

Lykurgæan system—originally applied only to Sparta—introduced equal severity of discipline, not equality of property.

indeed probable enough, that the two royal descendants of Hēraklēs might abuse their judicial function, as there are various instances known in which they take bribes; but they were not likely to abuse it in favour of an unprovided youth.

Next, as to adoption: Herodotus tells us that the ceremony of adoption was performed before the kings: probably enough there was some fee paid with it. But this affords no ground for presuming that they had any hand in determining *whom* the childless father was to adopt. According to the Attic law about

adoption, there were conditions to be fulfilled, consents to be obtained, the absence of disqualifying circumstances verified, &c.; and some authority before which this was to be done was indispensable (See Meier and Schömann, *Attisch. Prozess*, b. iii. ch. ii. p. 436). At Sparta such authority was vested by ancient custom in the king; but we are not told, nor is it probable, "that he could interpose, in opposition to the wishes of individuals, to relieve poverty," as Dr. Thirlwall supposes.

¹ *Σπάρτα δαμασίουβροτος*, Simonidēs, apud Plutarch. Agesilaus, c. 1.

instructive at least, however unsatisfactory, to political students—that with all this equality of dealing, he ends in creating a community in whom not merely the love of pre-eminence, but even the love of money, stands powerfully and specially developed.¹

How far the peculiar of the primitive Sparta extended we have no means of determining; but its limits down the valley of the Eurotas were certainly narrow, inasmuch as it did not reach so far as Amyklæ. Nor can we tell what principles the Dorian conquerors may have followed in the original allotment of lands within the limits of that peculiar. Equal apportionment is not probable, because all the individuals of a conquering band are seldom regarded as possessing equal claims; but whatever the original apportionment may have been, it remained without any general or avowed disturbance until the days of Agis III. and Kleomenês III. Here then we have the primitive Sparta, including Dorian warriors with their Helot subjects, but no Perioeki. And it is upon these Spartans separately, perhaps after the period of aggravated disorder and lawlessness noticed by Herodotus and Thucydidês, that the painful but invigorating discipline above sketched must have been originally brought to bear.

The gradual conquest of Laconia, with the acquisition of additional lands and new Helots, and the formation of the order of Perioeki, both of which were a consequence of it—is to be considered as posterior to the introduction of the Lykurgæan system at Sparta, and as resulting partly from the increased force which that system imparted. The career of conquest went on, beginning from Têleklos, for nearly three centuries—with some interruptions indeed, and in the case of the Messenian war, with a desperate and even precarious struggle—so that in the time of Thucydidês, and for some time previously, the Spartans possessed two-fifths of Peloponnesus. And this series of new acquisitions and victories disguised the really weak point of the Spartan system, by rendering it possible either to plant the poorer citizens as Perioeki in a conquered township, or to supply them with lots of land, of which they could receive the produce without leaving the city—so that their numbers and their military strength were prevented from declining. It is even affirmed by Aristotle, that during these early times they augmented the number of their citizens by fresh admissions, which of course implies the acquisi-

Original
Dorian allot-
ment of land
in Sparta
unknown—
probably
not equal.

Gradual
conquest of
Laconia,
the result
of the new
force im-
parted by
the Lykur-
gæan disci-
pline.

¹ Aristotel. Polit. ii. 6, 9, 19, 23. τὸ φιλότιμον—τὸ φιλοχρήματον.

tion of additional lots of land.¹ But successful war (to use an expression substantially borrowed from the same philosopher) was necessary to their salvation: the establishment of their ascendancy, and of their maximum of territory, was followed, after no very long interval, by symptoms of decline.² It will hereafter be seen that at the period of the conspiracy of Kinadôn (395 B.C.), the full citizens (called Homoioi or Peers) were considerably inferior in number to the Hypomeiōnes, or Spartans who could no longer furnish their qualification, and had become disfranchised. And the loss thus sustained was very imperfectly repaired by the admitted practice sometimes resorted to by rich men, of associating with their own children the children of poorer citizens, and paying the contribution of these latter to the public tables, so as to enable them to go through the prescribed course of education and discipline—whereby they became (under the title or sobriquet of Mothakes³) citizens, with a certain taint of inferiority; yet were sometimes appointed to honourable commands.

Laconia, the state and territory of the Lacedæmonians, was affirmed at the time of its greatest extension to have comprehended 100 cities⁴—this after the conquest of Messenia, so that it would

¹ Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 12.

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 6, 22. *Τοιγαροῦν ἐσώζοντο πολεμοῦντες, ἀπώλοντο δὲ ἄρξαντες, &c.* Compare also vii. 13, 15.

³ Plutarch, Kleomen. c. 8; Phylarch. ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 271.

The strangers called *Τρόφιμοι*, and the illegitimate sons of Spartans, whom Xenophon mentions with eulogy, as "having partaken in the honourable training of the city," must probably have been introduced in this same way, by private support from the rich (Xenoph. Hellen. v. 3, 9). The *xenêlasy* must have then become practically much relaxed, if not extinct.

⁴ Strabo, viii. p. 362; Steph. Byz. *Ἀθναί.*

Construing the word *πόλεις* extensively, so as to include townships small as well as considerable, this estimate is probably inferior to the truth; since even during the depressed times of modern Greece a fraction of the ancient Laconia (including in that term Messenia) exhibited much more than 100 *bourgs*.

In reference merely to the territory called Maina, between Calamata in the Messenian Gulf and Capo di Magna, the western part of the peninsula of Træ-

narus, see a curious letter addressed to the Duc de Nevers in 1618 (on occasion of a projected movement to liberate the Morea from the Turks, and to assure to him the sovereignty of it, as descendant of the Palæologi) by a confidential agent whom he despatched thither—M. Chateaurenaud—who sends to him "une sorte de tableau statistique du Magne, où sont énumérés 125 bourgs ou villages renfermans 4913 feux, et pouvant fournir 10,000 combattans, dont 4000 armés, et 6000 sans armes (between Calamata and Capo di Magna)." (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, tom. xv. 1842, p. 329. *Mémoire de M. Berger de Xivrey.*)

This estimate is not far removed from that of Colonel Leake towards the beginning of the present century, who considers that there were then in Mani (the same territory) 130 towns and villages; and this too in a state of society exceedingly disturbed and insecure—where private feuds and private towers (or *pyrghi*) for defence were universal, and in parts of which, Colonel Leake says, "I see men preparing the ground for cotton, with a dagger and pistols at their girdles. This, it seems, is the ordinary armour of the

include all the southern portion of Peloponnesus, from Thyrea on the Argolic Gulf to the southern bank of the river Nedon in its course into the Ionian Sea. But Laconia, more strictly so called, was distinguished from Messenia, and was understood to designate the portion of the above-mentioned territory which lay to the east of Mount Taygetus. The conquest of Messenia by the Spartans we shall presently touch upon; but that of Laconia proper is very imperfectly narrated to us. Down to the reign of Têlekus, as has been before remarked, Amyklæ, Pharos and Geronthræ were still Achæan: in the reign of that prince they were first conquered, and the Achæans either expelled or subjugated. It cannot be doubted that Amyklæ had been previously a place of consequence: in point of heroic antiquity and memorials, this city, as well as Therapnæ, seems to have surpassed Sparta. And the war of the Spartans against it is represented as a struggle of some moment—indeed in those times the capture of any walled city was tedious and difficult. Timomachus, an Ægeid from Thebes,¹ at the head of a body of his countrymen, is said to have rendered essential service to the Spartans in the conquest of the Achæans of Amyklæ; and the brave resistance of the latter was commemorated by a monument erected to Zeus Tropæus at Sparta, which was still to be seen in the time of Pausanias.² The Achæans of Pharos and Geronthræ, alarmed by the fate of Amyklæ, are said to have surrendered their towns with little or no resistance: after which the inhabitants of all the three cities, either wholly or in part, went into exile beyond sea, giving place to colonists from Sparta.³ From this time forward, according to Pausanias, Amyklæ continued as a village.⁴ But as the Amyklæan hoplites constituted a valuable portion of the Spartan army, it must have been numbered among the cities of the Periœki, as one of the hundred;⁵ the distinction between a dependent city and

Conquest of
Amyklæ,
Pharos and
Geronthræ,
by king
Têlekus.

cultivator when there is no particular suspicion of danger: the shepherd is almost always armed with a musket.” “The Maniotes reckon their population at 30,000, and their muskets at 10,000.” (Leake, *Travels in Morea*, vol. i. ch. vii. pp. 243, 263–266.)

Now under the dominion of Sparta all Laconia doubtless enjoyed complete internal security, so that the idea of the cultivator tilling his land in arms would be unheard of. Reasoning upon the basis of what has just been stated about the Maniote population and number of

townships, 100 πόλεις for all Laconia is a very moderate computation.

¹ Aristot. *Λακων. Πολιτεία*, ap. Schol. Pindar. *Isth.* vii. 18.

I agree with M. Boeckh, that Pindar himself identifies this march of the Ægeids to Amyklæ with the original Herakleid conquest of Peloponnesus. (Notæ Criticæ ad Pindar. *Pyth.* v. 74. p. 479.)

² Pausan. iii. 2, 6; iii. 12, 7.

³ Pausan. iii. 22, 5.

⁴ Pausan. iii. 19, 5.

⁵ Xenoph. *Hellen.* iv. 5, 11.

a village not being very strictly drawn. The festival of the Hyacinthia, celebrated at the great temple of the Amyklæan Apollo, was among the most solemn and venerated in the Spartan calendar.

It was in the time of Alkamenês the son of Têleklos that the Spartans conquered Helus, a maritime town on the left bank of the Eurotas, and reduced its inhabitants to ^{Helus conquered by Alkamenês.} bondage—from whose name,¹ according to various authors, the general title *Helots*, belonging to all the serfs of Laconia, was derived. But of the conquest of the other towns of Laconia—Gytheium, Akriæ, Therapnæ, &c.—or of the eastern land on the coast of the Argolic Gulf, including Brasiaë and Epidaurus Limêra, or the island of Kythêra, all which at one time belonged to the Argeian confederacy, we have no accounts.

Scanty as our information is, it just enables us to make out a progressive increase of force and dominion on the part of the Spartans, resulting from the organisation of Ly- ^{Progressive increase of Sparta.} kurgus. Of this progress a farther manifestation is found, besides the conquest of the Achæans in the south by Têleklos and Alkamenês, in their successful opposition to the great power of Pheidôn the Argeian, related in a previous chapter. We now approach the long and arduous efforts by which they accomplished the subjugation of their brethren the Messenian Dorians.

¹ Pausan. iii. 2, 7; iii. 20, 6. Strabo, viii. p. 363.

If it be true (as Pausanias states) that the Argeians aided Helus to resist, their

assistance must probably have been given by sea; perhaps from Epidaurus Limêra, or Prasiæ, when these towns formed part of the Argeian federation.

CHAPTER VII.

FIRST AND SECOND MESSENIAN WARS.

THAT there were two long contests between the Lacedæmonians and Messenians, and that, in both, the former were completely victorious, is a fact sufficiently attested. And if we could trust the statements in Pausanias—our chief and almost only authority on the subject—we should be in a situation to recount the history of both these wars in considerable detail. But unfortunately the incidents narrated in that writer have been gathered from sources which are, even by his own admission, undeserving of credit—from Rhianus, the poet of Bêné in Krête, who had composed an epic poem on Aristomenês and the second Messenian war, about B.C. 220—and from Myrôn of Priênê, a prose author whose date is not exactly known, but belonging to the Alexandrine age, and not earlier than the third century before the Christian æra. From Rhianus we have no right to expect trustworthy information, while the accuracy of Myrôn is much depreciated by Pausanias himself—on some points even too much, as will presently be shown. But apart from the mental habits either of the prose writer or the poet, it does not seem that any good means of knowledge were open to either of them, except the poems of Tyrtæus, which we are by no means sure that they ever consulted. The account of the two wars, extracted from these two authors by Pausanias, is a string of *tableaux*, several of them indeed highly poetical, but destitute of historical coherence or sufficiency; and O. Müller has justly observed, that “absolutely no reason is given in them for the subjection of Messenia.”¹ They

¹ History of the Dorians, i. 7, 10 (note). It seems that Diodorus had given a history of the Messenian wars in considerable detail, if we may judge from a fragment of the last seventh book, containing the debate between Kleonnis and Aristomenês. Very probably it was taken from Ephorus—though this we do not know.

For the statements of Pausanias respecting Myrôn and Rhianus, see iv. 6. Besides Myrôn and Rhianus, however, he seems to have received oral statements from contemporary Messenians and Lacedæmonians; at least on some occasions he states and contrasts the two contradictory stories (iv. 4, 4; iv. 5, 1).

are accounts unworthy of being transcribed in detail into the pages of general history, nor can we pretend to do anything more than verify a few leading facts of the war.

The poet Tyrtæus was himself engaged on the side of the Spartans in the second war, and it is from him that we learn the few indisputable facts respecting both the first and the second. If the Messenians had never been re-established in Peloponnesus, we should probably never have heard any farther details respecting these early contests. That re-establishment, together with the first foundation of the city called Messênê on Mount Ithômê, was among the capital wounds inflicted on Sparta by Epaminondas, in the year B.C. 369—between 300 and 250 years after the conclusion of the second Messenian war. The descendants of the old Messenians, who had remained for so long a period without any fixed position in Greece, were incorporated in the new city, together with various Helots and miscellaneous settlers who had no claim to a similar genealogy. The gods and heroes of the Messenian race were reverentially invoked at this great ceremony, especially the great hero Aristomenês;¹ and the sight of Mount Ithômê, the ardour of the newly established citizens, the hatred and apprehension of Sparta, operating as a powerful stimulus to the creation and multiplication of what are called *traditions*, sufficed to expand the few facts known respecting the struggles of the old Messenians into a variety of details. In almost all these stories we discover a colouring unfavourable to Sparta, contrasting forcibly with the account given by Isokratês in his Discourse called Archidamus, wherein we read the view which a Spartan might take of the ancient conquests of his forefathers. But a clear proof that these Messenian stories had no real basis of tradition, is shown in the contradictory statements respecting the principal hero Aristomenês; for some place him in the first, others in the second, of the two wars. Diodôrus and Myrôn both placed him in the first; Rhianus in the second. Though Pausanias gives it as his opinion that the account of the latter is preferable, and that Aristomenês really belongs to the second Messenian war, it appears to me that the one statement is as much worthy of belief as the other, and that there is no sufficient evidence for deciding between them—a conclusion which is substantially the same with that of Wesseling, who thinks that there were two persons named Aristomenês, one in the first and

Chiefly belong to the time after the foundation of Messênê by Epaminondas.

¹ Pausan. iv. 27, 2-3; Diodor. xv. 77.

one in the second war.¹ This inextricable confusion respecting the greatest name in Messenian antiquity, shows how little any genuine stream of tradition can here be recognised.

Absence of real or ancient traditions concerning these wars: contradictions about the Messenian hero Aristomenês.

Dates of the first wars—B.C. 743—724.

Pausanias states the first Messenian war as beginning in B.C. 743 and lasting till B.C. 724—the second as beginning in B.C. 685 and lasting till B.C. 668. Neither of these dates rest upon any assignable positive authority; but the time assigned to the first war seems probable, while that of the second is apparently too early. Tyrtaeus authenticates both the duration of the first war, twenty years, and the eminent services rendered in it by the Spartan king Theopompus.² He says moreover (speaking during the second war), “the fathers of our fathers conquered Messênê;” thus loosely indicating the relative dates of the two.

The Spartans (as we learn from Isokratês, whose words date from a time when the city of Messênê was only a recent foundation) professed to have seized the territory, partly in revenge for the impiety of the Messenians in killing their own king the Herakleid Kresphontês, whose relative had appealed to

Causes alleged by the Spartans.

¹ See Diodor. *Fragm. lib. viii. vol. iv. p. 30*: in his brief summary of Messenian events (xv. 66) he represents it as a matter on which authors differed, whether Aristomenês belonged to the first or second war. Clemens Alexand. (*Prot. p. 36*) places him in the *first*, the same as Myrôn, by mentioning him as having killed Theopompus.

Wesseling observes (ad Diod. l. c.), “Duo fuerunt Aristomenes, uterque in Messeniorum contra Spartanos bello illustrissimus, alter posteriore, priore alter bello.”

Unless this duplication of homonymous persons can be shown to be probable, by some collateral evidence, I consider it only as tantamount to a confession, that the difficulty is insoluble.

Pausanias is reserved in his manner of giving judgement,—*ὁ μὲν τοι Ἀριστομένης δόξη γὰρ ἐμῇ γέγονεν ἐπὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ ὑστέρου* (iv. 6). Müller (*Dorians, i. 7, 9*) goes much too far when he affirms that the statement of Myrôn was “in the teeth of all tradition.” Müller states incorrectly the citation from Plutarch, *Agis, c. 21* (see his note *h*). Plutarch there says nothing about *Tyrtaeus*: he says that the Messenians affirmed that their hero Aris-

tomenês had *killed* the Spartan king Theopompus, whereas the Lacedæmonians said that he had only *wounded* the king. According to *both* accounts, then, it would appear that Aristomenês belonged to the *first* Messenian war, *not to the second*.

² Tyrtaeus, *Fragm. 6*. Gaisford. But Tyrtaeus ought not to be understood to affirm distinctly (as Pausanias, Mr. Clinton, and Müller, all think) that Theopompus survived and put a close to the war: his language might consist with the supposition that Theopompus had been slain in the war—*Ὁν δία* (Theopompus), *Μεσσήνην εἵλομεν εὐρύχορον*.

For we surely might be authorised in saying—“It was through Epaminondas that the Spartans were conquered and humbled: or it was through Lord Nelson that the French fleet was destroyed in the last war,” though both of them perished in the accomplishment.

Tyrtaeus therefore does not contradict the assertion, that Theopompus was slain by Aristomenês, nor can he be cited as a witness to prove that Aristomenês did not live during the *first* Messenian war; which is the purpose for which Pausanias quotes him (iv. 6).

Sparta for aid—partly by sentence of the Delphian oracle. Such were the causes which had induced them first to invade the country, and they had conquered it after a struggle of twenty years.¹ The Lacedæmonian explanations, as given in Pausanias, seem for the most part to be counter-statements arranged after the time when the Messenian version, evidently the interesting and popular account, had become circulated.

It has already been stated that the Lacedæmonians and Messenians had a joint border temple and sacrifice in honour of Artemis Limnatis, dating from the earliest times of their establishment in Peloponnesus. The site of this temple near the upper course of the river Nedon, in the mountainous territory north-east of Kalamata, but west of the highest ridge of Taygetus, has recently been exactly verified—and it seems in these early days to have belonged to Sparta. That the quarrel began at one of these border sacrifices was the statement of both parties, Lacedæmonians and Messenians. According to the latter, the Lacedæmonian king Tëleklus laid a snare for the Messenians, by dressing up some youthful Spartans as virgins and giving them daggers; whereupon a contest ensued, in which the Spartans were worsted and Tëleklus slain. That Tëleklus was slain at the temple by the Messenians, was also the account of the Spartans—but they affirmed that he was slain in attempting to defend some young Lacedæmonian maidens, who were sacrificing at the temple, against outrageous violence from the Messenian youth.² In spite of the death of this

Spartan king
Tëleklus
slain by the
Messenians
at the temple
of Artemis
Limnatis.

¹ Isokratēs (Archidamus), Or. vi. p. 121–122.

² Strabo (vi. p. 257) gives a similar account of the sacrilege and murderous conduct of the Messenian youth at the temple of Artemis Limnatis. His version, substantially agreeing with that of the Lacedæmonians, seems to be borrowed from Antiochus, the contemporary of Thucydides, and is therefore earlier than the foundation of Messenē by Epaminondas, from which event the philo-Messenian statements take their rise. Antiochus, writing during the plenitude of Lacedæmonian power, would naturally look upon the Messenians as irretrievably prostrate, and the impiety here narrated would in his mind be the natural cause why the divine judgements overtook them. Ephorus gives a similar account (ap. Strabo. vi. p. 280).

Compare Herakleidēs Ponticus (ad

calcem Cragii De Rep. Laced. p. 528) and Justin, iii. 4.

The possession of this temple of Artemis Limnatis—and of the Ager Dentheliates, the district in which it was situated—was a subject of constant dispute between the Lacedæmonians and Messenians after the foundation of the city of Messenē, even down to the time of the Roman emperor Tiberius (Tacit. Annal. iv. 43). See Stephan. Byz. v. *Δελφάνιοι*; Pausan. iii. 2, 6; iv. 4, 2; iv. 31, 3. Strabo, viii. p. 362.

For the situation of the temple of Artemis Limnatis, and the description of the Ager Dentheliates, see Professor Ross, *Reisen im Peloponnes*, i. p. 5–11. He discovered two boundary-stones with inscriptions, dating from the time of the early Roman emperors, marking the confines of Lacedæmon and Messenē; both on the line of the highest ridge of Taygetus, where the waters separate

king, however, the war did not actually break out until some little time after, when Alkamenês and Theopompus were kings at Sparta, and Antiochus and Androklês, sons of Phintas, kings of Messenia. The immediate cause of it was, a private altercation between the Messenian Polycharês (victor at the fourth Olympiad, B.C. 764) and the Spartan Euæphnus. Polycharês, having been grossly injured by Euæphnus, and his claim for redress having been rejected at Sparta, took revenge by aggressions upon other Lacedæmonians. The Messenians refused to give him up; though

First Mes-
senian war.

one of the two kings, Androklês, strongly insisted upon doing so, and maintained his opinion so earnestly against the opposite sense of the majority and of his brother Antiochus, that a tumult arose, and he was slain. The Lacedæmonians, now resolving upon war, struck the first blow without any formal declaration, by surprising the border town of Ampheia, and putting its defenders to the sword. They farther overran the Messenian territory, and attacked some other towns, but without success. Euphaês, who had now succeeded his father Antiochus as king of Messenia, summoned the forces of the country and carried on the war against them with energy and boldness. For the first four years of the war the Lacedæmonians made no progress, and even incurred the ridicule of the old men of their nation as faint-hearted warriors. In the fifth year, however, they undertook a more vigorous invasion, under their two kings, Theopompus and Polydôrus, who were met by Euphaês with the full force of the Messenians. A desperate battle ensued, in which it does not seem that either side gained much advantage: nevertheless the Messenians found themselves so much enfeebled by it, that they were forced to take refuge on the fortified mountain of Ithômê, abandoning the rest of the country. In their distress they sent to

Messenian
kings Eu-
phaês and
Aristodêmus.

solicit counsel and protection from Delphi, but their messenger brought back the appalling answer that a virgin of the royal race of Æpytus must be sacrificed for their salvation. At the tragic scene which ensues, Aristodêmus puts to death his own daughter, yet without satisfying the exigencies of the oracle. The war still continued, and in the thirteenth year

east and west, and considerably to the eastward of the temple of Artemis Limnatis, so that at that time the Ager Dentheliates was considered a part of Messenia.

I now find that Colonel Leake (*Peloponnesiaca*, p. 181) regards these Inscrip-

tions discovered by Professor Ross as not proving that the temple of Artemis Limnatis was situated near the spot where they were found. His authority weighs much with me on such a point, though the arguments which he here employs do not seem to me conclusive.

of it another hard-fought battle took place, in which the brave Euphaëus was slain, but the result was again indecisive. Aristodêmus, being elected king in his place, prosecuted the war strenuously. The fifth year of his reign is signalised by a third general battle, wherein the Corinthians assist the Spartans, and the Arcadians and Sikyonians are on the side of Messenia; the victory is here decisive on the side of Aristodêmus, and the Lacedæmonians are driven back into their own territory.¹ It was now their turn to send envoys and ask advice from the Delphian oracle. The remaining events of the war exhibit a series, partly of stratagems to fulfil the injunctions of the priestess,—partly of prodigies in which the divine wrath is manifested against the Messenians. The king Aristodêmus, agonised with the thought that he has slain his own daughter without saving his country, puts an end to his own life.² In the twentieth year of the war the Messenians abandoned Ithômê, which the Lacedæmonians razed to the ground: the rest of the country being speedily conquered, such of the inhabitants as did not flee either to Arcadia or to Eleusis, were reduced to complete submission.

Messenians concentrate themselves on Mount Ithômê—after a long siege they are completely conquered.

Such is the abridgement of what Pausanias³ gives as the narrative of the first Messenian war. Most of his details bear the evident stamp of mere late romance; and it will easily be seen that the sequence of events presents no plausible explanation of that which is really indubitable—the result. The twenty years' war, and the final abandonment of Ithômê is attested by Tyrtæus beyond all doubt, as well as the harsh treatment of the conquered. "Like asses worn down by heavy burthens"⁴ (says the Spartan poet), "they were compelled to make over to their masters an entire half of the produce of their fields, and to come in the garb of woe to Sparta, themselves

Harsh treatment and Helotism of the conquered Messenians under Sparta.

¹ It is perhaps to this occasion that the story of the Epeunakti in Theopompus referred (ap. Athenæ. vi. p. 271),—Helots adopted into the sleeping-place of their masters who had been slain in the war, and who were subsequently enfranchised.

The story of the Partheniæ, obscure and unintelligible as it is, belongs to the foundation of the colony of Taras or Tarentum (Strabo, vi. p. 279).

² See Plutarch, De Superstitione, p. 168.

³ See Pausan. iv. 6–14.

An elaborate discussion is to be seen in Manso's Sparta on the authorities

whom Pausanias has followed in his History of the Messenian Wars, 18. Beilage, tom. ii. p. 264.

"It would evidently be folly (he observes, p. 270) to suppose that in the history of the Messenian wars, as Pausanias lays them before us, we possess the true history of these events."

⁴ Tyrtæus, Fragm. 5, 6 (Schneidewin).

C. F. Hermann conceives the treatment of the Messenians after the first war as mild in comparison with what it became after the second (Lehrbuch der Griech. Staatsalterthümer, sect. 31), a supposition which the emphatic words of Tyrtæus render inadmissible.

and their wives, as mourners at the decease of the kings and principal persons." The revolt of their descendants, against a yoke so oppressive, goes by the name of the second Messenian war.

Had we possessed the account of the first Messenian war as given by Myrôn and Diodôrus, it would evidently have been very different from the above, because they included Aristomenês in it, and to him the leading parts would be assigned. As the narrative now stands in Pausanias, we are not introduced to that great Messenian hero—the Achilles of the epic of Rhianus¹—until the second war, in which his gigantic proportions stand prominently forward. He is the great champion of his country in the three battles which are represented as taking place during this war: the first, with indecisive result, at Deræ; the second, a signal victory on the part of the Messenians, at the Boar's Grave; the third, an equally signal defeat, in consequence of the traitorous flight of Aristokrates king of the Arcadian Orchomenus, who, ostensibly embracing the alliance of the Messenians, had received bribes from Sparta. Thrice did Aristomenês sacrifice to Zeus Ithomatês the sacrifice called Hekatomphonia,² reserved for those who had slain with their own hands 100 enemies in battle. At the head of a chosen band he carried his incursions more than once into the heart of the Lacedæmonian territory, surprised Amyklæ and Pharis, and even penetrated by night into the unfortified precinct of Sparta itself, where he suspended his shield as a token of defiance in the temple of Athênê Chalkiœkus. Thrice was he taken prisoner, but on two occasions marvellously escaped before he could be conveyed to Sparta: the third occasion was more fatal, and he was cast by order of the Spartans into the Keadas, a deep rocky cavity in Mount Taygetus into which it was their habit to precipitate criminals. But even in this emergency the divine aid³ was not withheld from him. While the fifty Messenians who shared his punishment were all killed by the shock, he alone was both supported by the gods so as to reach the bottom unhurt, and enabled to find an unexpected means of escape. For when, abandoning all hope, he had wrapped himself up in his cloak to die, he perceived

Revolt of the
Messenians
against
Sparta—
second Mes-
senian war—
Aristomenês.

His chival-
rous exploits
and narrow
escapes—end
of the second
war—the
Messenians
again con-
quered.

¹ This is the express comparison introduced by Pausanias, iv. 5, 2.

² Plutarch, Sept. Sapient. Convivium, p. 159.

³ Pausan. iv. 18, 4. Ἀριστομένην δὲ

ἔς τε τὰ ἄλλα θεῶν τις, καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἐφύλασσε.

Plutarch (De Herodot. Malignitat. p. 856) states that Herodotus had mentioned Aristomenês as having been made

a fox creeping about among the dead bodies: waiting until the animal approached him, he grasped its tail, defending himself from its bites as well as he could by means of his cloak; and being thus enabled to find the aperture by which the fox had entered, enlarged it sufficiently for crawling out himself. To the surprise both of friends and enemies he again appeared alive and vigorous at Eira. That fortified mountain, on the banks of the river Nedon, and near the Ionian sea, had been occupied by the Messenians after the battle in which they had been betrayed by Aristokratês the Arcadian; it was there that they had concentrated their whole force, as in the former war at Ithômê, abandoning the rest of the country. Under the conduct of Aristomenês, assisted by the prophet Theoklus, they maintained this strong position for eleven years. At length they were compelled to abandon it. Yet as in the case of Ithômê, the final determining circumstances are represented to have been, not any superiority of bravery or organization on the part of the Lacedæmonians, but treacherous betrayal and stratagem, seconding the fatal decree of the gods. Unable to maintain Eira longer, Aristomenês, with his sons and a body of his countrymen, forced his way through the assailants and quitted the country—some of them retiring to Arcadia and Elis, and finally migrating to Rhegium. He himself passed the remainder of his days in Rhodes, where he dwelt along with his son-in-law Damagêtus, the ancestor of the noble Rhodian family called the Diagorids, celebrated for its numerous Olympic victories.

Such are the main features of what Pausanias calls¹ the second Messenian war, or of what ought rather to be called the Aristomeneïs of the poet Rhianus. That after the foundation of Messênê, and the recall of the exiles by Epaminondas, favour and credence was found for many tales respecting the prowess of the ancient hero whom they invoked² in their libations—tales well calculated to interest the fancy, to vivify the patriotism, and to inflame the anti-Spartan antipathies, of the new inhabitants—there can be little doubt.

Narrative of Pausanias, borrowed from the poet Rhianus, is undeserving of credit.

prisoner by the Lacedæmonians: but Plutarch must here have been deceived by his memory, for Herodotus does not mention Aristomenês.

¹ The narrative in Pausanias, iv. 15–24.

According to an incidental notice in Herodotus, the Samians affirmed that they had aided Lacedæmon in war

against Messênê,—at what period we do not know (Herodot. iii. 56).

² Τοὺς δὲ Μεσσηνίους οἶδα αὐτὸς ἐπὶ ταῖς σπονδαῖς Ἀριστομένην Νικομήδους καλοῦντας (Pausan. ii. 14, 5). The practice still continued in his time.

Compare also Pausan. iv. 27, 3; iv. 32, 3–4.

And the Messenian maidens of that day may well have sung in their public processional sacrifices,¹ how “Aristomenês pursued the flying Lacedæmonians down to the mid-plain of Stenyklêrus and up to the very summit of the mountain.” From such stories (*traditions* they ought not to be denominated) Rhianus may doubtless have borrowed; but if proof were wanting to show how completely he looked at his materials from the point of view of the poet and not from that of the historian, we should find it in the remarkable fact noticed by Pausanias. Rhianus represented Leotychides as having been king of Sparta during the second Messenian war: now Leotychides (as Pausanias observes) did not reign until near a century and a half afterwards, during the Persian invasion.²

To the great champion of Messenia, during this war, we may oppose on the side of Sparta another remarkable person, less striking as a character of romance, but more interesting in many ways to the historian—I mean the poet Tyrtæus, a native of Aphidnæ in Attica, an inestimable ally of the Lacedæmonians during most part of this second struggle. According to a story—which however has the air partly of a boast of the later Attic orators—the Spartans, disheartened at the first successes of the Messenians, consulted the Delphian oracle, and were directed to ask for a leader from Athens. The Athenians complied by sending Tyrtæus, whom Pausanias and Justin represent as a lame man and a school-master, despatched with a view of nominally obeying the oracle, and yet rendering no real assistance.³ This seems to be a colour-

The poet Tyrtæus, the ally of Sparta—his great efficiency and influence over the Spartan mind.

¹ Pausanias heard the song himself (iv. 16, 4)—Ἐπέλεγον ᾄσμα τὸ καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι ἀδόμενον:—

* Ἐς τε μέσον πέδιον Στενυκλήριον ἔς τ' ὄρος ἄκρον
Εἴπετ' Ἀριστομένης τοῖς Δακεδαμονίοις.

According to one story, the Lacedæmonians were said to have got possession of the person of Aristomenês and killed him: they found in him a hairy heart (Steph. Byz. v. Ἀνδανία).

² Pausan. iv. 15, 1.

Perhaps Leotychides was king during the last revolt of the Helots or Messenians in 464 B.C., which is called the third Messenian war. He seems to have been then in exile, in consequence of his venality during the Thessalian expedition—but not yet dead (Herodot. vi. 72). Of the reality of what Mr. Clinton calls the *third* Messenian war in 490 B.C.,

I see no adequate proof (see Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 257).

The poem of Rhianus was entitled Μεσσηνιακά. He also composed Θεσσαλικά, Ἡλιακά, Ἀχαϊκά. See the fragments—they are very few—in Düntzer's Collection, p. 67-77.

He seems to have mentioned Nikoteleia, the mother of Aristomenês (Fr. ii. p. 73): compare Pausan. iv. 14, 5.

I may remark that Pausanias throughout his account of the second Messenian war names king Anaxander as leading the Lacedæmonian troops: but he has no authority for so doing, as we see by iv. 15, 1. It is a pure calculation of his own from the πατέρων πατέρες of Tyrtæus.

³ Pausan. iv. 15, 3; Justin. iii. 5, 4. Compare Plato, Legg. ii. p. 630; Diodor. xv. 66; Lycurg. cont. Leokrat. p. 162.

ing put upon the story by later writers, but the intervention of the Athenians in the matter in any way deserves little credit.¹ It seems more probable that the legendary connexion of the Dioskuri with Aphidnæ, celebrated at or near that time by the poet Alkman, brought about through the Delphian oracle the presence of the Aphidnæan poet at Sparta. Respecting the lameness of Tyrtæus, we can say nothing. But that he was a schoolmaster (if we are constrained to employ an unsuitable term) is highly probable—for in that day, minstrels who composed and sung poems were the only persons from whom the youth received any mental training. Moreover his sway over the youthful mind is particularly noted in the compliment paid to him in after-days by king Leonidas—"Tyrtæus was an adept in tickling the souls of youth."² We see enough to satisfy us that he was by birth a stranger, though he became a Spartan by the subsequent recompense of citizenship conferred upon him—that he was sent through the Delphian oracle—that he was an impressive and efficacious minstrel—and that he had moreover sagacity enough to employ his talents for present purposes and diverse needs; being able not merely to re-animate the languishing courage of the baffled warrior, but also to soothe the discontents of the mutinous. That his strains, which long maintained undiminished popularity among the Spartans,³ contributed much to determine the ultimate issue of this war, there is no reason to doubt; nor is his name the only one to attest the susceptibility of the Spartan mind in that day towards music and poetry. The first establishment of the Karneian festival with its musical competition at Sparta, falls during the period assigned by Pausanias to the second Messenian war: the Lesbian harper Terpander, who gained the first recorded prize at this solemnity, is affirmed to have been sent for by the Spartans pursuant to a mandate from the Delphian oracle, and to have been the means of appeasing a sedition. In like manner, the Kretan Thalêtas was invited thither during a pestilence, which his art (as it is pretended) contributed to heal (about 620 B.C.); and Alkman, Xenokritus, Polymnastus, and Sakadas, all foreigners by birth, found favourable reception, and acquired popularity by their music and poetry. With the

Musical susceptibilities of the Spartans.

Philochorus and Kallisthenês also represented him as a native of Aphidnæ in Attica, which Strabo controverts upon slender grounds (viii. p. 362); Philochor. Fr. 56 (Didot).

¹ Plutarch, Theseus, c. 33; Pausan.

i. 41, 5; Welcker, Alkman. Fragm. p. 20.

² Plutarch, Kleomen. c. 2. Ἀγαθὸς νέων ψυχὰς αἰκάλλειν.

³ Philochorus, Frag. 56, ed. Didot; Lycurgus cont. Leokrat. p. 163.

exception of Sakadas, who is a little later, all these names fall in the same century as Tyrtæus, between 660 B.C.—610 B.C. The fashion which the Spartan music continued for a long time to maintain, is ascribed chiefly to the genius of Terpander.¹

The training in which a Spartan passed his life consisted of exercises warlike, social, and religious, blended together. While the individual, strengthened by gymnastics, went through his painful lessons of fatigue, endurance and aggression—the citizens collectively were kept in the constant habit of simultaneous and regulated movement in the warlike march, in the religious dance, and in the social procession. Music and song, being constantly employed to direct the measure and keep alive the spirit² of these multitudinous movements, became associated with the most powerful feelings which the habitual self-suppression of a Spartan permitted to arise, and especially with those sympathies which are communicated at once to an assembled crowd. Indeed the musician and the minstrel were the only persons who ever addressed themselves to the feelings of a Lacedæmonian assembly.

Powerful
ethical effect
of the old
Grecian
music.

Moreover the simple music of that early day, though destitute of artistical merit and superseded afterwards by more complicated combinations, had nevertheless a pronounced ethical character. It wrought much more powerfully on the impulses and resolutions of the hearers, though it tickled the ear less gratefully, than the scientific compositions of after-days. Farther, each particular style of music had its own appropriate mental effect—the Phrygian mode imparted a wild and maddening stimulus; the Dorian mode created a settled and deliberate resolution, exempt alike from the desponding and from the impetuous sentiments.³ What is called the Dorian mode, seems to be in reality the old native Greek mode as contradistinguished from the Phrygian and Lydian—these being the three primitive modes, subdivided and combined only in later times, with which the first Grecian musicians became conversant. It probably acquired its title of Dorian from the musical celebrity of Sparta and Argos, during the seventh and sixth centuries before the Christian æra; but it belonged as much to the Arca-

¹ See Plutarch, *De Musicâ*, pp. 1134, 1142, 1146.

² Thucyd. v. 69; Xenoph. *Rep. Laced.* c. 13.

³ See the treatise of Plutarch, *De Musicâ*, passim, especially c. 17, p. 1136, &c.; 33. p. 1143. Plato, *Republ.*

iii. p. 399; Aristot. *Polit.* viii. 6, 5-8.

The excellent treatise *De Metris Pindari*, prefixed by M. Boeckh to his edition of Pindar, is full of instruction upon this as well as upon all other points connected with the Grecian music (see lib. iii. c. 8. p. 238).

dians and Achæans as to the Spartans and Argeians. And the marked ethical effects, produced both by the Dorian and the Phrygian modes in ancient times, are facts perfectly well-attested, however difficult they may be to explain upon any general theory of music.

That the impression produced by Tyrtæus at Sparta, therefore, with his martial music, and emphatic exhortations to bravery in the field, as well as union at home, should have been very considerable, is perfectly consistent with the character both of the age and of the people; especially as he is represented to have appeared pursuant to the injunction of the Delphian oracle. From the scanty fragments remaining to us of his elegies and anapæsts, however, we can satisfy ourselves only of two facts: first, that the war was long, obstinately contested, and dangerous to Sparta as well as to the Messenians; next, that other parties in Peloponnesus took part on both sides, especially on the side of the Messenians. So frequent and harassing were the aggressions of the latter upon the Spartan territory, that a large portion of the border land was left uncultivated: scarcity ensued, and the proprietors of the deserted farms, driven to despair, pressed for a redivision of the landed property in the state. It was in appeasing these discontents that the poem of Tyrtæus called *Eunomia*, "Legal order," was found signally beneficial.¹ It seems certain that a considerable portion of the Arcadians, together with the Pisatæ and the Triphylians, took part with the Messenians; there are also some statements numbering the Eleians among their allies, but this appears not probable. The state of the case rather seems to have been, that the old quarrel between the Eleians and the Pisatæ respecting the right to preside at the Olympic games, which had already burst forth during the preceding century in the reign of the Argeian Pheidôn, still continued. Unwilling dependents of Elis, the Pisatæ and Triphylians took part with the subject Messenians, while the masters at Elis and Sparta made common cause, as they had before done against Pheidôn.² Pantaleôn king of Pisa, revolting from Elis, acted as commander of his countrymen in co-operation with the Messenians; and he is farther noted for having, at the period of the 34th Olympiad (644 B.C.), marched a body of

Sufferings of
the Spartans
in the second
Messenian
war.

¹ Aristot. *Polit.* v. 7, 1; Pausan. iv. 355, where the *Νέστορος ἀπόγονοι* mean the Pylians of Triphylia.

18, 2.

² Pausan. vi. 12, 2; Strabo, viii. p.

troops to Olympia, and thus dispossessed the Eleians, on that occasion, of the presidency: that particular festival—as well as the 8th Olympiad, in which Pheidôn interfered,—and the 104th Olympiad, in which the Arcadians marched in,—were always marked on the Eleian register as non-Olympiads, or informal celebrations. We may reasonably connect this temporary triumph of the Pisatans with the Messenian war, inasmuch as they were no match for the Eleians single-handed, while the fraternity of Sparta with Elis is in perfect harmony with the scheme of Peloponnesian politics which we have observed as prevalent even before and during the days of Pheidôn.¹ The second Messenian

¹ Respecting the position of the Eleians and Pisatæ during the second Messenian war, there is confusion in the different statements: as they cannot all be reconciled, we are compelled to make a choice.

That the Eleians were allies of Sparta, and the Pisatans of Messenia—also that the contests of Sparta and Messenia were mixed up with those of Elis and Pisa about the agonothesia of the Olympic games—is conformable to one distinct statement of Strabo (viii. pp. 355, 358), and to the passage in Phavorinus v. *Αἰγέας*, and is moreover indirectly sustained by the view given in Pausanias respecting the relations between Elis and Pisa (vi. 22, 2), whereby it clearly appears that the agonothesia was a matter of standing dispute between the two, until the Pisatans were finally crushed by the Eleians in the time of Pyrrhus, son of Pantaleôn. Farther, this same view is really conformable to another passage in Strabo, which, as now printed, appears to contradict it, but which is recognised by Müller and others as needing correction, though the correction which they propose seems to me not the best. The passage (viii. p. 362) stands thus: Πλεονάκης δ' ἐπολέμησαν (Messenians and Lacedæmonians) διὰ τὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν Μεσσηνίων. Τὴν μὲν οὖν πρώτην κατὰκττην αὐτῶν φησὶ Τυρταῖος ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι κατὰ τοὺς τῶν πατέρων πατέρας γενέσθαι· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, καθ' ἣν ἐλόμενοι συμμάχους Ἡλείους καὶ Ἀργείους καὶ Πισατὰς ἀπέστησαν, Ἀρκάδων μὲν Ἀριστοκράτην τὸν Ὀρχομένου βασιλέα παρεχομένων στρατηγὸν, Πισατῶν δὲ Πανταλέοντα τὸν Ὀμφαλίωτος· ἥνικα φησιν αὐτὸς στρατηγήσαι τὸν πόλεμον τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις, &c. Here it is obvious that in the enumeration of allies, the

Arcadians ought to have been included; accordingly both O. Müller and Mr. Clinton (ad annum 672 B.C.) agree in altering the passage thus: they insert the words καὶ Ἀρκάδας after the word Ἡλείους, so that both *Eleians* and *Pisatans* appear as allies of Messenia at once. I submit that this is improbable in itself, and inconsistent with the passage of Strabo previously noticed: the proper way of altering the passage is (in my judgement) to substitute the word Ἀρκάδας in place of the word Ἡλείους, which makes the two passages of Strabo consistent with each other, and hardly does greater violence to the text.

As opposed to the view here adopted, there is undoubtedly the passage of Pausanias (iv. 15, 4) which numbers the Eleians among the allies of Messenia, and takes no notice of the Pisatæ. The affirmation of Julius Africanus (ap. Eusebium Chronic. i. p. 145, that the Pisatæ revolted from Elis in the 30th Olympiad, and celebrated the Olympic games themselves until Ol. 52, for twenty-two successive ceremonies) is in contradiction—first, with Pausanias (vi. 22, 2), which appears to me a clear and valuable statement, from its particular reference to the three non-Olympiads—secondly, with Pausanias (v. 9, 4), when the Eleians in the 50th Olympiad determine the number of Hellenodikæ. I agree with Corsini (Fasti Attici, t. iii. p. 47) in setting aside the passage of Julius Africanus: Mr. Clinton (F. H. p. 253) is displeased with Corsini for this suspicion, but he himself virtually does the same thing, for in order to reconcile Jul. Africanus with Pausanias, he introduces a supposition quite different from what is asserted by either of them; i. e. a joint agonothesia by Eleians and

war will thus stand as beginning somewhere about the 33rd Olympiad, or 648 B.C., between seventy and eighty years after the close of the first, and lasting, according to Pausanias, seventeen years; according to Plutarch, more than twenty years.¹

Date of the second war, B.C. 648—631.

Many of the Messenians who abandoned their country after this second conquest are said to have found shelter and sympathy among the Arcadians, who admitted them to a new home and gave them their daughters in marriage; and who moreover punished severely the treason of Aristokratês, king of Orchomenus, in abandoning the Messenians at the battle of the Trench. That perfidious leader was put to death and his race dethroned, while the crime as well as the punishment was farther commemorated by an inscription, which was to be seen near the altar of Zeus Lykæus in Arcadia. The inscription doubtless existed in the days of Kallisthenês, in the generation after the restoration

Punishment of the traitor Aristokratês, king of the Arcadian Orchomenus.

Pisatans together. This hypothesis of Mr. Clinton appears to me gratuitous and inadmissible: Africanus himself meant to state something quite different, and I imagine him to have been misled by an erroneous authority. See Mr. Clinton, F. H. ad ann. 660 B.C. to 580 B.C.

¹ Plutarch, De Serâ Num. Vind. p. 548; Pausan. iv. 15, 1; iv. 17, 3; iv. 23, 2.

The date of the second Messenian war, and the interval between the second and the first, are points respecting which also there is irreconcilable discrepancy of statement: we can only choose the most probable: see the passages collected and canvassed in O. Müller (Dorians, i. 7, 11, and in Mr. Clinton, Fast. Hellen. vol. i. Appendix 2. p. 257).

According to Pausanias, the second war lasted from B.C. 685–668, and there was an interval between the first and the second war of 39 years. Justin (iii. 5) reckons an interval of eighty years; Eusebius an interval of ninety years. The main evidence is the passage of Tyrtæus, wherein that poet, speaking during the second war, says, “The fathers of our fathers conquered Messênê.”

Mr. Clinton adheres very nearly to the view of Pausanias; he supposes that the real date is only six years lower (679–662). But I agree with

Clavier (Histoire des Premiers Temps de la Grèce, t. ii. p. 233) and O. Müller (l. c.) in thinking that an interval of thirty-nine years is too short to suit the phrase of *fathers’ fathers*. Speaking in the present year (1846), it would not be held proper to say, “The fathers of our fathers carried on the war between 1793 and the peace of Amiens;” we should rather say, “The fathers of our fathers carried on the American war and the Seven Years’ war.” An age is marked by its mature and even elderly members—by those between thirty-five and fifty-five years of age.

Agreeing as I do here with O. Müller, against Mr. Clinton, I also agree with him in thinking that the best mark which we possess of the date of the second Messenian war is the statement respecting Pantaleôn: the 34th Olympiad, which Pantaleôn celebrated, probably fell within the time of the war; which would thus be brought down much later than the time assigned by Pausanias, yet not so far down as that named by Eusebius and Justin: the exact year of its commencement, however, we have no means of fixing.

Krebs, in his discussions on the Fragments of the lost Books of Diodorus, thinks that that historian placed the beginning of the second Messenian war in the 35th Olympiad (B.C. 640) (Krebs, Lectiones Diodoræ, p. 254–260).

of Messênê. But whether it had any existence prior to that event, or what degree of truth there may be in the story about Aristokratês, we are unable to determine:¹ the son of Aristokratês, named Aristodêmus, is alleged in another authority to have reigned afterwards at Orchomenus.² That which stands strongly marked is, the sympathy of Arcadians and Messenians against Sparta—a sentiment which was in its full vigour at the time of the restoration of Messênê.

The second Messenian war was thus terminated by the complete subjugation of the Messenians. Such of them as remained in the country were reduced to a servitude probably not less hard than that which Tyrtæus described them as having endured between the first war and the second. In after-times, the whole territory which figures on the map as Messenia,—south of the river Nedon, and westward of the summit of Taygetus,—appears as subject to Sparta, and as forming the western portion of Laconia; distributed (in what proportion we know not) between Pericæic towns and Helot villages. By what steps, or after what degree of farther resistance, the Spartans conquered this country we have no information; but we are told that they made over Asinê to the expelled Dryopes from the Argolic peninsula, and Mothônê to the fugitives from Nauplia.³ Nor do we hear of any serious revolt from Sparta in this territory until 150 years afterwards,⁴ subsequent to the Persian invasion,—a revolt which Sparta, after serious efforts, succeeded in crushing, so that the territory remained in her power until her defeat at Leuktra, which led to the foundation of Messênê by Epaminondas. The fertility of the plains—especially of the central portion near the river Pamisus, so much extolled by observers, modern as well as ancient—rendered it an acquisition highly valuable. At some time or other, it must of course have been formally partitioned among the Spartans, but it is probable that different and successive allotments were made, according as the various portions of

¹ Diodor. xv. 66; Polyb. iv. 33, who quotes Kallisthenês; Paus. viii. 5, 8. Neither the inscription, as cited by Polybius, nor the allusion in Plutarch (*De Serâ Numin. Vindictâ*, p. 548), appear to fit the narrative of Pausanias, for both of them imply secret and long-concealed treason, tardily brought to light by the interposition

of the gods; whereas Pausanias describes the treason of Aristokratês at the battle of the Trench as palpable and flagrant.

² Herakleid. Pontic. ap. Diog. Laërt. i. 94.

³ Pausan. iv. 24, 2; iv. 34, 6; iv. 35, 2.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 101.

territory, both to the east and to the west of Taygetus, were conquered. Of all this we have no information.¹

Imperfectly as these two Messenian wars are known to us, we may see enough to warrant us in making two remarks. Both were tedious, protracted, and painful, showing how slowly the results of war were then gathered, and adding one additional illustration to prove how much the rapid and instantaneous conquest of Laconia and Messenia by the Dorians, which the Herakleid legend sets forth, is contradicted by historical analogy. Both were characterised by a similar defensive proceeding on the part of the Messenians—the occupation of a mountain difficult of access, and the fortification of it for the special purpose and resistance—Ithômê (which is said to have had already a small town upon it) in the first war, Eira in the second. It is reasonable to infer from hence that neither their principal town Stenyklêrus, nor any other town in their country, was strongly fortified, so as to be calculated to stand a siege; that there were no walled towns among them analogous to Mykenæ and Tiryns on the eastern portion of Peloponnesus: and that perhaps what were called towns were, like Sparta itself, clusters of unfortified villages. The subsequent state of Helotism into which they were reduced is in consistency with this dispersed village residence during their period of freedom.

The Messenian Dorians had no considerable fortified places—lived in small townships and villages.

The relations of Pisa and Elis form a suitable counterpart and sequel to those of Messenia and Sparta. Unwilling subjects themselves, the Pisatans had lent their aid to the Messenians—and their king Pantaleôn, one of the leaders of this combined force, had gained so great a temporary success, as to dispossess the Eleians of the agonothesia or administration of the games for one Olympic ceremony, in the 34th Olympiad. Though again reduced to their condition of subjects, they manifested dispositions to renew the revolt at the 48th Olympiad, under Damophôn, the son of Pantaleôn, and the Eleians marched into their country to put them down, but were persuaded to retire by protestations of submission. At length, shortly afterwards, under Pyrrhus, the brother of Damophôn, a serious revolt broke

Relations of Pisa and Elis.

¹ Pausanias says, τὴν μὲν ἄλλην Μεσσηνίαν, πλὴν τῆς Ἀσινάων, αὐτοὶ διελάχοντο, &c. (iv. 24, 2).

In an apophthegm ascribed to King Polydorus, leader of the Spartans during the first Messenian war, he is asked,

whether he is really taking arms against his brethren, to which he replies, "No; I am only marching to the unallotted portion of the territory." (Plutarch, Apophthegm. Lakonic. p. 231.) — ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκλήρωτον χώραν.

out. The inhabitants of Dyspontium and the other villages in the Pisatid, assisted by those of Makistus, Skillus and the other towns in Triphylia, took up arms to throw off the yoke of Elis; but their strength was inadequate to the undertaking. They were completely conquered; Dyspontium was dismantled, and the inhabitants of it obliged to flee the country, from whence most of them emigrated to the colonies of Epidamnus and Apollonia in Epirus. The inhabitants of Makistus and Skillus were also chased from their abodes, while the territory became more thoroughly subject to Elis than it had been before. These incidents seem to have occurred about the 50th Olympiad, or B.C. 580; and the dominion of Elis over her Periœkid territory was thus as well assured as that of Sparta.¹ The separate denominations both of Pisa and Triphylia became more and more merged in the sovereign name of Elis: the town of Lepreum alone, in Triphylia, seems to have maintained a separate name and a sort

Struggles of the Pisatæ and Triphylians for autonomy.—The latter in aftertimes sustained by the political interests of Sparta.

of half-autonomy down to the time of the Peloponnesian war, not without perpetual struggles against the Eleians.² But towards the period of the Peloponnesian war, the political interests of Lacedæmon had become considerably changed, and it was to her advantage to maintain the independence of the subordinate states against the superior: accordingly, we find her at that time up-

holding the autonomy of Lepreum. From what cause the devastation of the Triphylian towns by Elis, which Herodotus mentions as having happened in his time, arose, we do not know; the fact seems to indicate a continual yearning for their original independence, which was still commemorated, down to a much later period, by the ancient Amphiktyony at Samikum in Triphylia in honour of Poseidôn—a common religious festival frequented by all the Triphylian towns and celebrated by the inhabitants of Makistus, who sent round proclamation of a formal truce for the holy period.³ The Lacedæmonians, after the close of the Pelo-

¹ Pausan. vi. 22, 2; v. 6, 3; v. 10, 2: Strabo, viii. p. 355–357.

The temple in honour of Zeus at Olympia was first erected by the Eleians out of the spoils of this expedition (Pausan. v. 10, 2).

² Thucyd. v. 31. Even Lepreum is characterised as Eleian, however (Aristoph. Aves, 149): compare also Steph. Byz. v. Τριφυλία, ἡ Ἑλῆς.

Even in the sixth Olympiad an inhabitant of Dyspontium is proclaimed

as victor at the stadium, under the denomination of “*an Eleian from Dyspontium*,” proclaimed by the Eleians of course—the like in the 27th Olympiad: see Stephan. Byz. v. Δυσπόντιον, which shows that the inhabitants of the Pisatid cannot have rendered themselves independent of Elis in the 26th Olympiad, as Strabo alleges (viii. p. 365).

³ Herodot. iv. 149; Strabo, viii. p. 343.

ponnesian war had left them undisputed heads of Greece, formally upheld the independence of the Triphylian towns against Elis, and seem to have countenanced their endeavours to attach themselves to the Arcadian aggregate, which however was never fully accomplished. Their dependence on Elis became loose and uncertain, but was never wholly shaken off.¹

¹ Diodor. xiv. 17; xv. 77; Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 2, 23, 26.

It was about this period probably that

the idea of the local eponymus, Triphylus, son of Arkas, was first introduced (Polyb. iv. 77).

CHAPTER VIII.

CONQUESTS OF SPARTA TOWARDS ARCADIA AND ARGOLIS.

I HAVE described in the last two chapters, as far as our imperfect evidence permits, how Sparta came into possession both of the southern portion of Laconia along the course of the Eurotas down to its mouth, and of the Messenian territory westward. Her progress towards Arcadia and Argolis is now to be sketched, so as to conduct her to that position which she occupied during the reign of Peisistratus at Athens, or about 560-540 B.C.,—a time when she had reached the maximum of her territorial possessions, and when she was confessedly the commanding state in Hellas.

The central region of Peloponnesus, called Arcadia, had never received any immigrants from without. Its indigenous inhabitants—a strong and hardy race of mountaineers, the most numerous Hellenic tribe in the peninsula, and the constant hive for mercenary troops¹—were among the rudest and poorest of Greeks, retaining for the longest period their original subdivision into a number of petty hill-villages, each independent of the other; while the union of all who bore the Arcadian name (though they had some common sacrifices, such as the festival of the Lykæan Zeus, of Despoina, daughter of Poseidôn and Dêmêtêr, and of Artemis Hymnia²) was more loose and ineffective than that of Greeks generally, either in or out of Peloponnesus. The Arcadian villagers were usually denominated by the names of regions, coincident with certain ethnical subdivisions—the Azānes, the Parrhasii, the Mænalii (adjoining Mount Mænalus), the Eutrēsii, the Ægytæ, the Skiritæ,³ &c. Some considerable towns however

¹ Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27. 'Ἀνδράποδ' ἐκ Φρυγίας, ἀπὸ δ' Ἀρκαδίας ἐπικούρους. Also Xenoph. Hellen. vii. 1, 23. πλείστον δὲ φύλον τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν τὸ Ἀρκαδικὸν εἶη, &c.

² Pausan. viii. 6, 7; viii. 37, 6; viii. 38, 2. Xenias, one of the generals of Greek mercenaries in the service of Cyrus the younger, a native of the Parrhasian district in Arcadia, celebrates with great solemnity, during

the march upward, the festival and games of the Lykæa (Xenoph. Anab. i. 2, 10; compare Pindar, Olymp. ix. 142).

Many of the forests in Arcadia contained not only wild boars, but bears, in the days of Pausanias (viii. 23, 4).

³ Pausan. viii. 26, 5; Strabo, viii. p. 388.

Some geographers distributed the Arcadians into three subdivisions,

there were—aggregations of villages or demes which had been once autonomous. Of these the principal were Tegea and Mantinea, bordering on Laconia and Argolis—Orchomenus, Pheneus, and Stymphalus, towards the north-east, bordering on Achaia and Phlius—Kleitôr and Heræa, westward, where the country is divided from Elis and Triphylia by the woody mountains of Pholœ and Erymanthus—and Phigaleia, on the south-western border near to Messenia. The most powerful of all were Tegea and Mantinea¹—conterminous towns, nearly equal in force, dividing between them the cold and high plain of Tripolitza, and separated by one of those capricious torrents which only escapes through katabothra. To regulate the efflux of this water was a difficult task, requiring friendly co-operation of both the towns; and when their frequent jealousies brought on a quarrel, the more aggressive of the two inundated the territory of its neighbour as one means of annoyance. The power of Tegea, which had grown up out of nine constituent townships originally separate,² appears to have been more ancient than that of its rival; as we may judge from its splendid heroic pretensions connected with the name of Echemus, and from the post conceded to its hoplites in joint Peloponnesian armaments, which was second in distinction only to that of the Lacedæmonians.³ If it be correct, as Strabo asserts,⁴ that the incorporation of the

Azanes, Parrhasii, and Trapezuntii. Azan passed for the son of Arcas, and his lot in the division of the paternal inheritance was said to have contained seventeen towns (ἄς ἐλαχεν Ἀζήν). Stephan. Byz. v. Ἀζανία — Παρθασία. Kleitôr seems the chief place in Azania, as far as we can infer from genealogy (Pausan. viii. 4, 2, 3). Pæus or Pæos, from whence the Azanian suitor of the daughter of Kleisthenês presented himself, was between Kleitôr and Psôphis (Herod. vi. 127; Paus. viii. 23, 6). A Delphian oracle, however, reckons the inhabitants of Phigaleia, in the south-western corner of Arcadia, among the Azanes (Paus. viii. 42, 3).

The burial-place of Arcas was supposed to be on Mount Manalus (Paus. viii. 9, 2).

¹ Thucyd. v. 65. Compare the description of the ground in Professor Ross (Reisen im Peloponnes, iv. 7).

² Strabo, viii. p. 337.

³ Herodot. ix. 27.

⁴ Strabo, l. c. Mantinea is reckoned among the oldest cities of Arcadia (Polyb. ii. 54). Both Mantinea and

Orchomenus had originally occupied very lofty hill sites, and had been rebuilt on a larger scale, lower down nearer to the plain (Pausan. viii. 8, 3; 12, 4; 13, 2).

In regard to the relations, during the early historical period, between Sparta, Argos, and Arcadia, there is a new fragment of Diodorus (among those recently published by Didot out of the *Excerpta* in the Escorial library, *Fragment. Historic. Græcor.* vol. ii. p. viii.). The Argeians had espoused the cause of the Arcadians against Sparta; and at the expense of considerable loss and suffering, had regained such portions of Arcadia as she had conquered. The king of Argos restored this recovered territory to the Arcadians: but the Argeians generally were angry that he did not retain it and distribute it among them as a reward for their losses in the contest. They rose in insurrection against the king, who was forced to flee, and take refuge at Tegea.

We have nothing to illustrate this fragment, nor do we know to what king, date, or events, it relates

town of Mantinea, out of its five separate Demes, was brought about by the Argeians, we may conjecture that the latter adopted this proceeding as a means of providing some check upon their powerful neighbours of Tegea. The plain common to Tegea and Mantinea was bounded to the west by the wintry heights of Mænalus,¹ beyond which, as far as the boundaries of Laconia, Messenia, and Triphylia, there was nothing in Arcadia but small and unimportant townships or villages—without any considerable town, before the important step taken by Epaminondas in founding Megalopolis, a short time after the battle of Leuktra. The mountaineers of these regions who joined Epaminondas before the battle of Mantinea (at a time when Mantinea and most of the towns of Arcadia were opposed to him) were so inferior to the other Greeks in equipment, that they still carried as their chief weapon, in place of the spear, nothing better than the ancient club.²

Both Tegea and Mantinea held several of these smaller Arcadian townships near them in a sort of dependence, and were anxious to extend this empire over others: during the Peloponnesian war, we find the Mantineians establishing and garrisoning a fortress at Kypsela among the Parrhasii, near the site in which Megalopolis was afterwards built.³ But at this period, Sparta, as the political chief of Hellas—having a strong interest in keeping all the Grecian towns, small and great, as much isolated from each other as possible, and in checking all schemes for the formation of local confederacies—stood forward as the protectress of the autonomy of these smaller Arcadians, and drove back the Mantineians within their own limits.⁴ At a somewhat later period, during the acmé

Tegea and Mantinea the most powerful Arcadian towns before the building of Megalopolis.

¹ *Μαιναλίη δυσχείμερος* (Delphian Oracle, ap. Paus. viii. 9, 2).

² Xenophon, in describing the ardour with which Epaminondas inspired his soldiers before this final battle, says (vii. 5, 20), *προθύμως μὲν ἔλευκοῦντο οἱ ἱππεῖς τὰ κράνη, κελεύοντος ἑκείνου· ἔπειγράφοντο δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀρκάδων ὁπλίται, ῥόπαλα ἔχοντες, ὡς Θηβαῖοι ὕντες· πάντες δὲ ἠκονῶντο καὶ λόγχας καὶ μαχαίρας, καὶ ἐλαμπρύνοντο τὰς ἀσπίδας.*

It is hardly conceivable that these Arcadian clubmen should have possessed a shield and a full panoply. The language of Xenophon in calling them hoplites, and the term *ἐπείγραφοι* (properly referring to the inscription on the shield) appear to be conceived in a spirit of contemptuous

sneering, proceeding from Xenophon's miso-Theban tendencies: "the Arcadian hoplites with their clubs put themselves forward to be as good as the Thebans." That these tendencies of Xenophon show themselves in expressions very unbecoming to the dignity of history (though curious as evidences of the time) may be seen by vii. 5, 12, where he says of the Thebans—*ἐνταῦθα δὴ οἱ πῦρ πνέοντες, οἱ νενικηκότες τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, οἱ τῷ παντὶ πλείονες*, &c.

³ Thucyd. v. 33, 47, 81.

⁴ Thucyd. l. c. Compare the instructive speech of Kleigenês, the envoy from Akanthus, addressed to the Lacedæmonians, B.C. 382 (Xen. Hellen. v. 2, 15–16).

of her power, a few years before the battle of Leuktra, she even proceeded to the extreme length of breaking up the unity of Mantinea itself, causing the walls to be razed, and the inhabitants to be again parcelled into their five original Demes—a violent arrangement which the turn of political events very soon reversed.¹ It was not until after the battle of Leuktra and the depression of Sparta that any measures were taken for the formation of an Arcadian political confederacy;² and even then the jealousies of the separate cities rendered it incomplete and short-lived. The great permanent change, the establishment of Megalopolis, was accomplished by the ascendancy of Epaminondas. Forty petty Arcadian townships, among those situated to the west of Mount Mænalus, were aggregated into the new city; the jealousies of Tegea, Mantinea, and Kleitôr, were for a while suspended; and œkists came from all of them, as well as from the districts of the Mænalii and Par-rhasii, in order to impart to the new establishment a genuine Pan-Arcadian character.³ It was thus that there arose for the first time a powerful city on the borders of Laconia and Messenia, rescuing the Arcadian townships from their dependence on Sparta, and imparting to them political interests of their own, which rendered them both a check upon their former chief and a support to the re-established Messenians.

It has been necessary thus to bring the attention of the reader for one moment to events long posterior in the order of time (Megalopolis was founded in 370 B.C.), in order that he may understand, by contrast, the general course of those incidents of the earlier time, where direct accounts are wanting. The northern boundary of the Spartan territory was formed by some of the many small Arcadian townships or districts, several of which were successively conquered by the Spartans and incorporated with their dominion, though at what precise time we are unable to say. We are told that Charilaus, the reputed nephew and ward of Lykurgus, took Ægys, and that he also invaded the territory of Tegea, but with singular ill-success,

Encroach-
ments of
Sparta upon
the southern
boundary
of Arcadia.

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. v. 2, 1-6; Diodor. xv. 19.

² Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 5, 10-11; vii. 1, 23-25.

³ Pausan. viii. 27, 5. No œkist is mentioned from Orchomenus, though three of the petty townships contributing (*συμμετέλουντα*) to Orchomenus were embodied in the new city. The feud between the neighbouring cities of Orcho-

menus and Mantinea was bitter (Xen. Hellen. vi. 5, 11-22). Orchomenus and Hêræa both opposed the political confederation of Arcadia.

The oration of Demosthenes, *ὕπὲρ Μεγαπολιτῶν*, strongly attests the importance of this city, especially c. 10—*ἐὰν μὲν ἀναιρεθῶσι καὶ διοικισθῶσιν, ἰσχυροῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐϋθύς ἔστιν εἶναι*, &c.

for he was defeated and taken prisoner:¹ we also hear that the Spartans took Phigaleia by surprise in the 30th Olympiad, but were driven out again by the neighbouring Arcadian Oresthasians.² During the second Messenian war the Arcadians are represented as cordially seconding the Messenians: and it may seem perhaps singular, that while neither Mantinea nor Tegea are mentioned in this war, the more distant town of Orchomenus, with its king Aristokratês, takes the lead. But the facts of the contest come before us with so poetical a colouring, that we cannot venture to draw any positive inference as to the times to which they are referred.

Cenus³ and Karystus seem to have belonged to the Spartans in the days of Alkman: moreover the district called Skiritis, bordering on the territory of Tegea—as well as Belemina and Maleatis, to the westward, and Karyæ to the eastward and south-eastward, of Skiritis—forming all together the entire northern frontier of Sparta, and all occupied by Arcadian inhabitants—had been conquered and made part of the Spartan territory⁴ before 600 B.C. And Herodotus tells us, that at this period the Spartan kings Leon and Hegesiklês contemplated nothing less than the conquest of entire Arcadia, and sent to ask from the Delphian oracle a blessing on their enterprise.⁵ The priestess dismissed their wishes as extravagant, in reference to the whole of Arcadia, but encouraged them, though with the usual equivocations of language, to try their fortune against Tegea. Flushed with their course of previous success, not less than by the favourable construction which they put upon the words of the oracle, the Lacedæmonians marched against Tegea with such entire confidence of success, as to carry with them chains for the purpose of binding their expected prisoners. But the result was disappointment and defeat. They

¹ Pausan. iii. 2, 6; iii. 7, 3; viii. 48, 3.

² Pausan. viii. 39, 2.

³ Alkman, Fr. 15, Welcker; Strabo, x. p. 446.

⁴ That the Skiritæ were Arcadians is well-known (Thuc. v. 47; Steph. Byz. v. Σκίρος); the possession of Belemina was disputed with Sparta, in the days of her comparative humiliation, by the Arcadians: see Plutarch, Kleomenês, 4; Pausan. viii. 35, 4.

Respecting Karyæ (the border town of Sparta, where the διαβατήρια were sacrificed, Thuc. v. 55) see Photius Καρυά τε ι α—ἐορτὴ Ἀρτέμιδος: τὰς δὲ Καρύας Ἀρκάδων οὐσας ἀπετέμοντο Λακεδαιμόνιοι.

The readiness with which Karyæ and

the Maleates revolted against Sparta after the battle of Leuktra, even before the invasion of Laconia by the Thebans, exhibits them apparently as conquered foreign dependencies of Sparta, without any kindred of race (Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 5, 24–26; vii. 1, 28). Leuktron in the Maleatis seems to have formed a part of the territory of Megalopolis in the days of Kleomenês III. (Plutarch, Kleomenês, 6); in the Peloponnesian war it was the frontier town of Sparta towards Mount Lykæum (Thuc. v. 53).

⁵ Herod. i. 66. καταφρονήσαντες Ἀρκάδων κρέσσονες εἶναι, ἐχρηστηρίζοντο ἐν Δέλφοισι ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ Ἀρκάδων χώρῃ.

were repulsed with loss ; and the prisoners whom they left behind, bound in the very chains which their own army had brought, were constrained to servile labour on the plain of Tegea—the words of the oracle being thus literally fulfilled, though in a sense different from that in which the Lacedæmonians had first understood them.¹

For one whole generation, we are told, they were constantly unsuccessful in their campaigns against the Tegeans, and this strenuous resistance probably prevented them from extending their conquests farther among the petty states of Arcadia.

At length in the reign of Anaxandridês and Aristô, the successors of Leon and Hegesiklês (about 560 B.C.), the Delphian oracle, in reply to a question from the Spartans—which of the gods they ought to propitiate in order to become victorious—enjoined them to find and carry to Sparta the bones of Orestês, son of Agamemnon. After a vain search, since they did not know where the body of Orestês was to be found, they applied to the oracle for more specific directions, and were told that the son of Agamemnon was buried at Tegea itself, in a place “where two blasts were blowing under powerful constraint,—where there was stroke and counter-stroke, and destruction upon destruction.” These mysterious words were elucidated by a lucky accident. During a truce with Tegea, Lichas, one of the chiefs of the 300 Spartan chosen youth who acted as the moveable police of the country under the ephors, visited the place, and entered the forge of a blacksmith—who mentioned to him, in the course of conversation, that in sinking a well in his outer court he had recently discovered a coffin containing a body seven cubits long ; astounded at the sight, he had left it there undisturbed. It struck Lichas that the gigantic relic of aforetime could be nothing else but the corpse of Orestês, and he felt assured of this when he reflected how accurately the indications of the oracle were verified ; for there were the “two blasts blowing by constraint,” in the two bellows of the blacksmith : there was “the stroke and counter-stroke” in his hammer and anvil, as well as the “destruction upon destruction” in the murderous weapons which he was forging. Lichas said nothing, but returned to Sparta with his discovery, which he communicated to the authorities, who, by a concerted scheme, banished him under a pretended criminal accusation. He then again returned to Tegea, under the

¹ Herod. i. 67 ; Pausan. iii. 3, 5 ; viii. 45, 2.

Herodotus saw the identical chains

suspended in the temple of Athênê Alcea at Tegea.

They are directed by the oracle to bring to Sparta the bones of the hero Orestês.

guise of an exile, prevailed upon the blacksmith to let to him the premises, and when he found himself in possession, dug up and carried off to Sparta the bones of the venerated hero.¹

From and after this fortunate acquisition, the character of the contest was changed; the Spartans found themselves constantly victorious over the Tegeans. But it does not seem that these victories led to any positive result, though they might perhaps serve to enforce the practical conviction of Spartan superiority; for the territory of Tegea remained unimpaired, and its autonomy noway restrained. During the Persian invasion Tegea appears as the willing ally of Lacedæmon, and as the second military power in the Peloponnesus;² and we may fairly presume that it was chiefly the strenuous resistance of the Tegeans which prevented the Lacedæmonians from extending their empire over the larger portion of the Arcadian communities. These latter always maintained their independence, though acknowledging Sparta as the presiding power in Peloponnesus, and obeying her orders implicitly as to the disposal of their military force. And the influence which Sparta thus possessed over all Arcadia was one main item in her power, never seriously shaken until the battle of Leuktra; which took away her previous means of ensuring success and plunder to her minor followers.³

Having thus related the extension of the power of Sparta on her northern or Arcadian frontier, it remains to mention her acquisitions on the eastern and north-eastern side, towards Argos. Originally (as has been before stated) not merely the province of Kynuria and the Thyreātis, but also the whole coast down to the promontory of Malea, had either been part of the territory of Argos or belonged to the Argeian confederacy. We learn from Herodotus,⁴ that before the time when the embassy from Cræsus king of Lydia came to solicit aid in Greece (about 547 B.C.), the whole of this territory had fallen into the power of Sparta; but how long before, or at what precise epoch, we have no information. A considerable victory is said to have been gained by the Argeians over the Spartans in the 27th Olympiad or 669 B.C., at Hysiaë, on the road between Argos and Tegea.⁵ At that time it does not seem probable that Kynuria could have been in the possession of the Spartans—so that we must

Their operations against Tegea become more successful; nevertheless Tegea maintains her independence.

Boundaries of Sparta towards Argos— conquest of Thyreātis by Sparta.

¹ Herod. i. 69–70.

² Herod. ix. 26.

³ Xenoph. Hellen. v. 2, 19. "Ὀσπερ Ἀρκάδες, ὅταν μεθ' ἑμῶν ἴωσι, τὰ τε αὐτῶν σώζουσι καὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀρπά-

ζουσι, &c.

This was said to the Lacedæmonians about ten years before the battle of Leuktra.

⁴ Herod. i. 82.

⁵ Pausan. ii. 25, 1.

refer the acquisition to some period in the following century; though Pausanias places it much earlier, during the reign of Theopompus¹—and Eusebius connects it with the first establishment of the festival called Gymnopædia at Sparta in 678 B.C.

About the year 547 B.C., the Argeians made an effort to reconquer Thyrea from Sparta, which led to a combat long memorable in the annals of Grecian heroism. It was agreed between the two powers that the possession of this territory should be determined by a combat of 300 select champions on each side; the armies of both retiring, in order to leave the field clear. So undaunted, and so equal was the valour of these two chosen companies, that the battle terminated by leaving only three of them alive—Alkênôr and Chromius among the Argeians, Othryadês among the Spartans. The two Argeian warriors hastened home to report their victory, but Othryadês remained on the field, carried off the arms of the enemy's dead into the Spartan camp, and kept his position until he was joined by his countrymen the next morning. Both Argos and Sparta claimed the victory for their respective champions, and the dispute after all was decided by a general conflict, in which the Spartans were the conquerors, though not without much slaughter on both sides. The brave Othryadês, ashamed to return home as the single survivor of the 300, fell upon his own sword on the field of battle.²

This defeat decided the possession of Thyrea, which did not again pass, until a very late period of Grecian history, under the power of Argos. The preliminary duel of 300, with its uncertain issue, though well-established as to the general fact, was represented by the Argeians in a manner totally different from the above story, which seems to have been current among the Lacedæmonians.³ But the most remarkable

Battle of the 300 select champions, between Sparta and Argos, to decide the possession of the Thyreätis—valour of Othryadês.

Thyreätis comes into possession of Sparta—efforts of the Argeians to recover it.

¹ Pausan. iii. 7, 5.

² Herod. i. 82; Strabo, viii. p. 376.

³ The Argeians showed at Argos a statue of Perilaus, son of Alkênôr, killing Othryadês (Pausan. ii. 20, 6; ii. 38, 5; compare x. 9, 6, and the references in Larcher ad Herodot. i. 82). The narrative of Chrysermus, ἐν τρίτῳ Πελοποννησιακῶν (as given in Plutarch, Parallel. Hellenic. p. 306), is different in many respects.

Pausanias found the Thyreätis in possession of the Argeians (ii. 38, 5). They told him that they had recovered it by adjudication; when or by whom we do

not know: it seems to have passed back to Argos before the close of the reign of Kleomenês III. at Sparta (220 B.C.), Polyb. iv. 36.

Strabo even reckons Prasîæ as Argeian, to the south of Kynuria (viii. p. 368), though in his other passage (p. 374), seemingly cited from Ephorus, it is treated as Lacedæmonian. Compare Manso, Sparta, vol. ii. Beilage i. p. 48.

Eusebius, placing this duel at a much earlier period (Ol. 27, 3, 678 B.C.), ascribes the first foundation of the Gymnopædia at Sparta to the desire of commemorating the event. Pausanias (iii.

circumstance is, that more than a century afterwards—when the two powers were negotiating for a renewal of the then expiring truce—the Argeians, still hankering after this their ancient territory, desired the Lacedæmonians to submit the question to arbitration; which being refused, they next stipulated for the privilege of trying the point in dispute by a duel similar to the former, at any time except during the prevalence of war or of epidemic disease. The historian tells us that the Lacedæmonians acquiesced in this proposition, though they thought it absurd,¹ in consequence of their anxiety to keep their relations with Argos at that time smooth and pacific. But there is no reason to imagine that the real duel, in which Othryadês contended, was considered as absurd at the time when it took place or during the age immediately succeeding. It fell in with a sort of chivalrous pugnacity which is noticed among the attributes of the early Greeks,² and also with various legendary exploits, such as the single combat of Echemus and Hyllus, of Melanthus and Xanthus, of Menelaus and Paris, &c. Moreover, the heroism of Othryadês and his countrymen was a popular theme for poets not only at the Spartan gymnopædia,³ but also elsewhere, and appears to have been frequently celebrated. The absurdity

Alteration
in Grecian
opinion, as
to the prac-
tice of de-
ciding dis-
putes by
select cham-
pions.

attached to this proposition, then, during the Peloponnesian war—in the minds even of the Spartans, the most old-fashioned and unchanging people in Greece—is to be ascribed to a change in the Grecian political mind, at and after the Persian war. The habit of political calculation had made such decided progress among them, that the leading states especially had become familiarised with something like a statesmanlike view of their resources, their dangers, and their obligations. How lamentably deficient this sort of sagacity was during the Persian invasion, will appear when we come to describe that imminent crisis of Grecian independence: but the events of those days were well calculated to sharpen it for the future, and the Greeks of the Peloponnesian war had become far more refined political schemers than their forefathers. And thus it happened that the proposition to settle a territorial dispute by a duel of chosen champions, admissible and even becoming a century before, came afterwards to be derided as childish.

7, 3) places it still farther back, in the reign of Theopompus.

¹ Thucyd. v. 41. Τοῖς δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐδόκει μαρία εἶναι ταῦτα, ἔπειτα (ἐπεθύμουν γὰρ πάντως τὸ Ἄργος φίλιον ἔχειν) ξυνεχώρησαν ἐφ' οἷς ἡξίου, καὶ ξυνεγράψαντο.

² Herodot. vii. 9. Compare the challenge which Herodotus alleges to have been proclaimed to the Spartans by Mardonius, through a herald, just before the battle of Plataea (ix. 48).

³ Athenæ. xv. p. 678.

The inhabitants of Kynuria are stated by Herodotus to have been Ionians, but completely dorised through their long subjection to Argos, by whom they were governed as Perieki. Pausanias gives a different account of their race, which he traces to the eponymous hero Kynūrus son of Perseus: but he does not connect them with the Kynurians whom he mentions in another place as a portion of the inhabitants of Arcadia.¹ It is evident, that even in the time of Herodotus, the traces of their primitive descent were nearly effaced. He says they were "Orneates and Perieki" to Argos; and it appears that the inhabitants of Orneæ also, whom Argos had reduced to the same dependent condition, traced their eponymous hero to an Ionic stock—Orneus was the son of the Attic Erechtheus.² Strabo seems to have conceived the Kynurians as occupying originally, not only the frontier district of Argolis and Laconia, wherein Thyrea is situated, but also the north-western portion of Argolis, under the ridge called Lyrkeium, which separates the latter from the Arcadian territory of Stymphalus.³ This ridge was near the town of Orneæ, which lay on the border of Argolis near the confines of Phlius; so that Strabo thus helps to confirm the statement of Herodotus, that the Orneates were a portion of Kynurians, held by Argos along with the other Kynurians in the condition of dependent allies and Perieki, and very probably also of Ionian origin.

Kynurians
in Argolis
—said to be
of Ionic race,
but dorised.

The conquest of Thyrea (a district valuable to the Lacedæmonians, as we may presume from the large booty which the Argeians got from it during the Peloponnesian war)⁴ was the last territorial acquisition made by Sparta. She was now possessed of a continuous dominion, comprising the whole southern portion of the Peloponnesus, from the southern bank of the river Nedon on the western coast, to the northern boundary of Thyreātis on the eastern coast. The area of her territory, including as it did both Laconia and Messenia, was equal to two-fifths of the entire peninsula, all governed from the single city, and for the exclusive purpose and benefit of the citizens of Sparta. Within all this wide area there was not a single

Full acquisition of the southern portion of Peloponnesus, from sea to sea, by the Spartans, before 540 B.C.

¹ Herod. viii. 73; Pausan. iii. 2, 2; viii. 27, 3.

² Pausan. ii. 25, 5. Mannert (Geographie der Griechen und Römer, Griechenland, book ii. ch. xix. p. 618) connects the Kynurians of Arcadia and Argolis, though Herodotus tells us that the latter were Ionians: he gives to this name much greater importance and extension than the evidence bears out.

³ Strabo, viii. p. 370—*δ' Ἰναχος ἔχων τὰς πηγὰς ἐκ Δυρκίου τοῦ κατὰ Κυνοῦριον ὅπου τῆς Ἀρκადίας*. Coray and Grosskurd gain nothing here by the conjectural reading of *Ἀργείας* in place of *Ἀρκადίας*, for the ridge of Lyrkeium ran between the two, and might therefore be connected with either without impropriety.

⁴ Thucyd. vi. 95.

community pretending to independent agency. The townships of the Periœki, and the villages of the Helots, were each individually unimportant; nor do we hear of any one of them presuming to treat with a foreign state. All consider themselves as nothing else but subjects of the Spartan ephors and their subordinate officers. They are indeed discontented subjects, hating as well as fearing their masters, and not to be trusted if a favourable opportunity for secure revolt presents itself. But no individual township or district is strong enough to stand up for itself, while combinations among them are prevented by the habitual watchfulness and unscrupulous precautions of the ephors, especially by that jealous secret police called the Krypteia, to which allusion has already been made.

Not only therefore was the Spartan territory larger and its population more numerous than that of any other state in Hellas, but its government was also more completely centralised and more strictly obeyed. Its source of weakness was the discontent of its Periœki and Helots, the latter of whom were not (like the slaves of other states) imported barbarians from different countries, and speaking a broken Greek, but genuine Hellens—of one dialect and lineage, sympathising with each other, and as much entitled to the protection of Zeus Hellanius as their masters—from whom indeed they stood distinguished by no other line except the perfect training, individual and collective, which was peculiar to the Spartans. During the period on which we are at present dwelling, it does not seem that this discontent comes sensibly into operation; but we shall observe its manifestations very unequivocally after the Persian and during the Peloponnesian war.

To such auxiliary causes of Spartan predominance we must add another—the excellent military position of Sparta, and the unassailable character of Laconia generally. On three sides that territory is washed by the sea,¹ with a coast remarkably dangerous and destitute of harbours; hence Sparta had nothing to apprehend from this quarter until the Persian invasion and its consequences—one of the most remarkable of which was, the astonishing development of the Athenian naval force. The city of Sparta, far removed from the sea, was admirably defended by an almost impassable northern frontier, composed of those districts which we have observed above to have been conquered from Arcadia—Karyātis, Skirītis, Maleātis, and Belemīnātis. The difficulty as well as danger of marching into Laconia by these mountain passes, noticed

Great comparative power of Sparta at that early time.

¹ Xenophon, Hellen, iv. 8, 7: φοβούμενος τὴν ἀλιμενότητα τῆς χώρας.

by Euripidēs, was keenly felt by every enemy of the Lacedæmonians, and has been powerfully stated by a first rate modern observer, Colonel Leake.¹ No site could be better chosen for holding the key of all the penetrable passes than that of Sparta. This well-protected frontier was a substitute more than sufficient for fortifications to Sparta itself, which always maintained, down to the times of the despot Nabis, its primitive aspect of a group of adjacent hill-villages rather than a regular city.

When, along with such territorial advantages, we contemplate the personal training peculiar to the Spartan citizens, as yet undiminished in their numbers,—combined with the effect of that training upon Grecian sentiment, in inspiring awe and admiration,—we shall not be surprised to find, that during the half-century which elapsed between the year 600 B.C., and the final conquest of Thyreātis from Argos, Sparta had acquired and begun to exercise a recognised ascendancy over all the Grecian states. Her military force was at that time superior to that of any of the rest, in a degree much greater than it afterwards came to be; for other states had not yet attained their maximum, and Athens in particular was far short of

Careful personal training of the Spartans—at a time when other states had no training at all.

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. v. 5, 10; Eurip. ap. Strabo. viii. p. 366; Leake, Travels in Morea, vol. iii. c. xxii. p. 25.

"It is to the strength of the frontiers, and the comparatively large extent of country enclosed within them, that we must trace the primary cause of the Lacedæmonian power. These enabled the people, when strengthened by a rigid military discipline, and put in motion by an ambitious spirit, first to triumph over their weaker neighbours of Messenia, by this additional strength to overawe the disunited republics of Arcadia, and at length for centuries to hold an acknowledged military superiority over every other state in Greece.

"It is remarkable that all the principal passes into Laconia lead to one point: this point is Sparta; a fact which shows at once how well the position of that city was chosen for the defence of the province, and how well it was adapted, especially as long as it continued to be unwall'd, to maintain a perpetual vigilance and readiness for defence, which are the surest means of offensive success.

"The natural openings into the plain of Sparta are only two; one by the upper Eurotas, as the course of that river above Sparta may be termed; the

other by its only large branch Œnus, now the Kelefinā, which, as I have already stated, joins the Eurotas opposite to the north-eastern extremity of Sparta. All the natural approaches to Sparta from the northward lead to one or the other of these two valleys. On the side of Messenia, the northerly prolongation of Mount Taygetum, which joins Mount Lyceum at the pass of Andania, now the pass of Makryplái, furnishes a continued barrier of the loftiest kind, admitting only of routes easily defensible; and which—whether from the Cromitis of Arcadia to the south-westward of the modern Londári, from the Stenykleric plain, from the plain of the Pamisus, or from Phæræ, now Kalamáta—all descend into the valley of the upper Eurotas, and conduct to Sparta by Pellana. There was indeed a branch of the last-mentioned route which descended into the Spartan plain at the modern Mistra, and which must have been a very frequent communication between Sparta and the lower part of Messenia; but, like the other direct passes over Taygetum, it was much more difficult and defensible than those which I have called the natural entrances of the province."

the height which she afterwards reached. In respect to discipline as well as number, the Spartan military force had even at this early period reached a point which it did not subsequently surpass, while in Athens, Thebes, Argos, Arcadia, and even Elis (as will be hereafter shown), the military training in later days received greater attention, and improved considerably. The Spartans (observes Aristotle)¹ brought to perfection their gymnastic training and their military discipline, at a time when other Greeks neglected both the one and the other: their early superiority was that of the trained men over the untrained, and ceased in after-days when other states came to subject their citizens to systematic exercises of analogous character or tendency. This fact—the early period at which Sparta attained her maximum of discipline, power and territory—is important to bear in mind when we are explaining the general acquiescence which her ascendancy met with in Greece, and which her subsequent acts would certainly not have enabled her to earn. That acquiescence first began, and became a habit of the Grecian mind, at a time when Sparta had no rival to come near her—when she had completely shot ahead of Argos—and when the vigour of the Lycurgean discipline had been manifested in a long series of conquests, made during the stationary period of other states, and ending only (to use the somewhat exaggerated phrase of Herodotus) when she had subdued the greater part of Peloponnesus.²

Military institutions of Sparta—Peculiar and minute military subdivisions, distinct from the civil—Enomoties, &c.

Our accounts of the memorable military organisation of Sparta are scanty, and insufficient to place the details of it clearly before us. The arms of the Spartans, as to all material points, were not different from those of other Greek hoplites. But one grand peculiarity is observable from the beginning, as an item in the Lycurgean institutions. That lawgiver established military divisions quite distinct from the civil divisions, whereas in the other states of Greece, until a period much later than that which we have now reached, the two were confounded—the hoplites or horsemen of the same tribe or ward being marshalled together on the field of battle. Every Lacedæmonian was bound to military service from the age of twenty to sixty, and the ephors, when they sent forth an expedition, called to arms all the men within some given limit of age. Hero-

¹ Aristot. Polit. viii. 3, 4. Ἐτι δὲ αὐτοὺς τοὺς Λάκωνας ἴσμεν, ὥς μὲν αὐτοὶ προσήδρευον ταῖς φιλοπονίαις, ὑπερέχοντας τῶν ἄλλων· νῦν δὲ, καὶ τοῖς γυμνασίοις καὶ τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἀγῶσι, λειπομένους ἑτέρων· οὐ γὰρ τῷ τοῖς νέους γυμνάζειν τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον διέφερον, ἀλλὰ τῷ

μόνον μὴ πρὸς ἀσκοῦντας ἀσκεῖν.
² Ἀνταγωνιστὰς γὰρ τῆς παιδείας νῦν ἔχουσι· πρότερον δὲ οὐκ εἶχον.

² Herodot. i. 68. ἤδη δὲ σφί καὶ ἡ πολλὴ τῆς Πελοποννήσου ἦν κατεστραμμένη.

dotus tells us that Lykurgus established both the Syssitia or public mess and the Enômoties and Triākads, or the military subdivisions peculiar to Sparta.¹ The Triākads are not mentioned elsewhere, nor can we distinctly make out what they were; but the Enômoty was the special characteristic of the system, and the pivot upon which all its arrangements turned. It was a small company of men, the number of whom was variable, being given differently at 25, 32, or 36 men—drilled and practised together in military evolutions, and bound to each other by a common oath.² Each Enômoty had a separate captain or enomotarch, the strongest and ablest soldier of the company, who always occupied the front rank, and led the Enômoty when it marched in single file, giving the order of march as well as setting the example. If the Enômoty was drawn up in three, or four, or six files, the enomotarch usually occupied the front post on the left, and care was taken that both the front rank men and the rear rank men, of each file, should be soldiers of particular merit.³

It was upon these small companies that the constant and severe Lacedæmonian drilling was brought to act. They were taught to march in concert, to change rapidly from line to file, to wheel right

¹ Herodot. i. 67: compare Larcher's note.

Concerning the obscure and difficult subject of the military arrangements of Sparta, see Cragius, *Repub. Laced.* iv. 4; Manso, *Sparta*, ii. Beilage 18. p. 224; O. Müller, *Hist. Dorians*, iii. 12; Dr. Arnold's note on Thucydides, v. 68; and Dr. Thirlwall, *History of Greece*, vol. i. Appendix 3, p. 520.

² Pollux. i. 10, 129. Ἰδίως μέντοι τῶν Δακεδαιμονίων, ἐνωμοτία, καὶ μόρα: compare Suidas and Hesych. v. Ἐνωμοτία; Xenoph. *Rep. Lacon.* c. 11; Thucyd. v. 67–68; Xenoph. *Hellen.* vi. 4, 12.

Suidas states the enômoty at 25 men; in the Lacedæmonian army which fought at the first battle of Mantinea (418 B.C.), it seems to have consisted of about 32 men (Thuc. *l. c.*): at the battle of Leuktra of 36 men (Xen. *Hellen.* *l. c.*). But the language of Xenophon and Thucydides does not imply that the number of each enômoty was equal.

³ O. Müller states that the enomotarch, after a παραγωγή or deployment into phalanx, stood on the right hand, which is contrary to Xenoph. *Rep. Lac.* 11, 9.—Ὅτε δὲ ὁ ἄρχων ἐὼν νῦμος γίγνεται, οὐδ' ἐν τούτῳ μειονεκτεῖν ἡγοῦνται ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν—the

ἄρχων was the first enomotarch of the lochus, the πρωτοστάτης (as appears from 11, 5.), when the enômoty marched in single file. To put the ἡγεμὼν on the right flank, was done occasionally for special reason—ἦν δὲ ποτε ἕνεκα τινος δοκῇ ξυμφέρειν, τὸν ἡγεμόνα δέξιον κέρας ἔχειν, &c. I understand Xenophon's description of the παραγωγή or deployment differently from Müller—it rather seems that the enômoties which stood first made a side movement to the left, so that the first enomotarch still maintained his place on the left, at the same time that the opportunity was created for the enômoties in the rear to come up and form equal front (τῶ ἐνωμοτάρχῃ παρεγγύαται εἰς μέταπον παρ' ἄσπίδα καθίστασθαι)—the words παρ' ἄσπίδα have reference, as I imagine, to the proceeding of the first enomotarch, who set the example of side-movement to the left-hand, as it is shown by the words which follow—καὶ διὰ παντὸς οὗτος ἔστ' ἂν ἡ φάλαγξ ἐναντία καταστή. The phalanx was constituted when all the lochi formed an equal and continuous front, whether the sixteen enômoties (of which each lochus was composed) might be each in one file, in three files, or in six files.

or left in such manner as that the enomotarch and the other proto-states or front rank men should always be the persons immediately opposed to the enemy.¹ Their step was regulated by the fife, which played in martial measures peculiar to Sparta, and was employed in actual battle as well as in military practice; and so perfectly were they habituated to the movements of the Enômoty, that if their order was deranged by any adverse accident, scattered soldiers could spontaneously form themselves into the same order, each man knowing perfectly the duties belonging to the place into which chance had thrown him.² Above the Enômoty were several larger divisions—the Pentekostys, the Lochus, and the Mora,³ of which latter there seem to have been *six* in all. Respecting the number of each division, and the proportion of the larger to the smaller, we find statements altogether different, yet each

Careful
drilling of
the Enômo-
ties.

¹ See Xenoph. Anab. iv. 8, 10 upon the advantage of attacking the enemy with *ὄρθιοι λόχοι*, in which case the strongest and best soldiers all came first into conflict. It is to be recollected, however, that the practice of the Cyreian troops cannot be safely quoted as authority for the practice at Sparta. Xenophon and his colleagues established Lochi, Pentekosties and Enômoties in the Cyreian army: the Lochus consisted of 100 men, but the numbers of the other two divisions are not stated (Anab. iii. 4, 21; iv. 3, 26: compare Arrian, Tactic. cap. 6).

² The words of Thucydides indicate the peculiar marshalling of the Lacedæmonians, as distinguished both from their enemies and from their allies at the battle of Mantinea—*καὶ εὐθὺς ὑπὸ σπουδῆς καθίσταντο ἐς κόσμον τὸν αὐτῶν*, "Ἀγίδος τοῦ βασιλέως ἕκαστα ἐξηγουμένου κατὰ νόμον: again, c. 68.

About the music of the flute or fife, Thucyd. v. 69; Xen. Rep. Lac. 13, 9: Plutarch, Lycurg. c. 22.

³ Meursius, Dr. Arnold and Racchetti (Della Milizia dei Greci Antichi, Milan, 1807, p. 166) all think that Lochus and Mora were different names for the same division; but if this is to be reconciled with the statement of Xenophon in Repub. Lac. c. 11, we must suppose an actual change of nomenclature after the Peloponnesian war, which appears to be Dr. Arnold's opinion—yet it is not easy to account for.

There is one point in Dr. Thirlwall's Appendix which is of some importance, and in which I cannot but dissent from

his opinion. He says, after stating the nomenclature and classification of the Spartan military force as given by Xenophon, "Xenophon speaks only of Spartans, as appears by the epithet *πολιτικῶν*," p. 521: the words of Xenophon are, *Ἐκδότην δὲ τῶν πολιτικῶν μορῶν ἔχει πολέμαρχον ἕνα*, &c. (Rep. Lac. 11).

It appears to me that Xenophon is here speaking of the aggregate Lacedæmonian heavy-armed force, including both Spartans and Periæci—not of Spartans alone. The word *πολιτικῶν* does not mean Spartans as distinguished from Periæci; but Lacedæmonians, as distinguished from allies. Thus when Agesilaus returns home from the blockade of Phlius, Xenophon tells us that *ταῦτα ποιήσας τοὺς μὲν συμμάχους ἀφῆκε, τὸ δὲ πολιτικὸν οἴκαδε ἀπήγαγε* (Hellen. v. 3, 25).

O. Müller also thinks that the whole number of 5740 men, who fought at the first battle of Mantinea in the thirteenth year of the Peloponnesian war, were furnished by the city of Sparta itself (Hist. of Dorians, iii. 12, 2); and to prove this he refers to the very passage just cited from the Hellenica of Xenophon, which, as far as it proves anything, proves the contrary of his position. He gives no other evidence to support it, and I think it in the highest degree improbable. I have already remarked that he understands the expression *πολιτικὴ χώρα* (in Polybius, vi. 45) to mean the district of Sparta itself as contradistinguished from Laconia—a construction which seems to me not warranted by the passage in Polybius.

resting upon good authority,—so that we are driven to suppose that there was no peremptory standard, and that the Enômoty comprised 25, 32, or 36 men; the Pentekostys two or four Enômoties; the Lochus two or four Pentekosties, and the Mora, 400, 500, 600, or 900 men—at different times, or according to the limits of age which the ephors might prescribe for the men whom they called into the field.¹

What remains fixed in the system is, first, the small number, though varying within certain limits, of the elementary company called Enômoty, trained to act together, and composed of men nearly of the same age,² in which every man knew his place: secondly, the scale of divisions and the hierarchy of officers, each rising above the other,—the Enômotarch, the Pentekontêr, the Lochage, and the Polemarch, or commander of the Mora,—each having the charge of their respective divisions. Orders were transmitted from the king, as commander-in-chief, through the Polemarchs to the Lochages,—from the Lochages to the Pentekonfers, and then from the latter to the Enômotarchs, each of whom caused them to be executed by his Enômoty. As all these men had been previously trained to the duties of their respective stations, the Spartan infantry possessed the arrangements and aptitudes of a standing army. Originally they seem to have had no cavalry at all,³ and when cavalry was at length introduced into their system, it was of a very inferior character, no provision having been made for it in the Lykurgian training. But the military force of the other cities of Greece, even down to the close of the Peloponnesian war, enjoyed little or no special training, having neither any small company like the enômoty, consisting of particular men drilled to act together—nor fixed and disciplined officers—nor triple scale of

¹ Aristotle, *Λακωνων Πολιτεία*, *Fragm.* 5-6, ed. Neumann: Photius, v. *Λόχος*. Harpokration, *Μόρα*. *Etymologic. Mag.* *Μόρα*. The statement of Aristotle is transmitted so imperfectly that we cannot make out clearly what it was. Xenophon says that there were six moræ in all, comprehending all the citizens of military age (*Rep. Lac.* 11, 3). But Ephorus stated the mora at 500 men, Kallisthenes at 700, and Polybius at 900 (*Plutarch, Pelopid.* 17; *Diodor.* xv. 32). If all the citizens competent to bear arms were comprised in six moræ, the numbers of each mora must of course have varied. At the battle of Mantinea there were seven Lacedæmonian lochi,

each lochus containing four pentekosties, and each pentekosty containing four enômoties: Thucydides seems (as I before remarked) to make each enômoty thirty-two men. But Xenophon tells us that each mora had four lochi, each lochus two pentekosties, and each pentekosty two enômoties (*Rep. Lac.* 11, 4). The names of these divisions remain the same, but the numbers varied.

² This is implied in the fact, that the men under thirty, or under thirty-five years of age, were often detached in a battle to pursue the light troops of the enemy (*Xen. Hellen.* iv. 5, 15-16).

³ Xenoph. *Hellen.* vi. 4, 12.

subordination and subdivision. Gymnastics and the use of arms made a part of education everywhere, and it is to be presumed that no Grecian hoplite was entirely without some practice of marching in line and military evolutions, inasmuch as the obligation to serve was universal and often enforced. But such practice was casual and unequal, nor had any individual of Argos or Athens a fixed military place and duty. The citizen took arms among his tribe, under a Taxiarch chosen from it for the occasion, and was placed in a rank or line wherein neither his place nor his immediate neighbours were predetermined. The tribe appears to have been the only military classification known to Athens,¹ and the taxiarch the only tribe officer for infantry, as the phylarch was for cavalry, under the general-in-chief. Moreover, orders from the general were proclaimed to the line collectively by a herald of loud voice, not communicated to the taxiarch so as to make him responsible for the proper execution of them by his division. With an arrangement thus perfunctory and unsystematised, we shall be surprised to find how well the military duties were often performed. But every Greek who contrasted it with the symmetrical structure of the Lacedæmonian armed force, and with the laborious preparation of every Spartan for his appropriate duty, felt an internal sentiment of inferiority which made him willingly accept the headship of "these professional artists in the business of war,"² as they are often denominated.

It was through the concurrence of these various circumstances

¹ Herodot. vi. 111; Thucyd. vi. 98; Xenoph. Hellen. iv. 2, 19.

The same marshalling of hoplites, according to the civil tribes to which they belonged, is seen in the inhabitants of Messenê in Sicily as well as of Syracuse (Thucyd. iii. 90; vi. 100).

At Argos there was a body of 1000 hoplites, who during the Peloponnesian war received training in military manœuvres at the cost of the city (Thucyd. v. 67), but there is reason to believe that this arrangement was not introduced until about the period of the peace of Nikias in the tenth or eleventh year of the Peloponnesian war, when the truce between Argos and Sparta was just expiring, and when the former began to entertain schemes of ambition. The Epariti in Arcadia began at a much later time, after the battle of Leuktra (Xenoph. Hellen. vii. 4, 33).

About the Athenian Taxiarchs, one to each tribe, see Æschines de Fals. Leg.

c. 53. p. 300 R.; Lysias, pro Mantitheo, Or. xvi. p. 147; Demosth. adv. Boeotum pro nomine, p. 999 R. Philippic. i. p. 47.

See the advice given by Xenophon (in his Treatise De Officio Magistri Equitum) for the remodelling of the Athenian cavalry, and for the introduction of small divisions, each with its special commander. The division into tribes is all that he finds recognised (Off. M. E. C. ii. 2-iv. 9); he strongly recommends giving orders—διὰ παραγγέλσεως, and not ἀπὸ κήρυκος.

² Plutarch, Pelopid. c. 23. Πάντων ἄκροι τεχνίται καὶ σοφισταὶ τῶν πολεμικῶν ὄντες οἱ Σπαρτιάται, &c. (Xenoph. Rep. Lac. c. 14) ἡγησαῖο ἂν, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους αὐτοσχεδιαστὰς εἶναι τῶν στρατιωτικῶν, Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ μόνους τῷ ὄντι τεχνίτας τῶν πολεμικῶν. . . . ὥστε τῶν δεομένων γίγνεσθαι οὐδὲν ἀπορεῖται· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπρόσκεπτόν ἐστιν.

that the willing acknowledgment of Sparta as the leading state of Hellas became a part of Grecian habitual sentiment, during the interval between about 600 B.C. and 547 B.C. During this period too, chiefly, Greece and her colonies were ripening into a sort of recognised and active partnership. The common religious assemblies, which bound the parts together, not only acquired greater formality and more extended development, but also became more numerous and frequent—while the Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean games were exalted into a national importance, approaching to that of the Olympic. The recognised superiority of Sparta thus formed part and parcel of the first historical aggregation of the Grecian states. It was about the year 547 B.C., that Cræsus of Lydia, when pressed by Cyrus and the Persians, solicited aid from Greece, addressing himself to the Spartans as confessed presidents of the whole Hellenic body.¹ And the tendencies then at work, towards a certain degree of increased intercourse and co-operation among the dispersed members of the Hellenic name, were doubtless assisted by the existence of a state recognised by all as the first—a state whose superiority was the more readily acquiesced in, because it was earned by a painful and laborious discipline, which all admired, but none chose to copy.²

Recognised superiority of Sparta—a part of early Grecian sentiment—coincident with the growing tendency to increased communion.

Whether it be true (as O. Müller and other learned men conceive) that the Homeric mode of fighting was the general practice in Peloponnesus and the rest of Greece anterior to the invasion of the Dorians, and that the latter first introduced the habit of fighting with close ranks and protended spears, is a point which cannot be determined. Throughout all our historical knowledge of Greece, a close rank among the hoplites, charging with spears always in hand, is the prevailing practice; though there are cases of exception, in which

Homeric mode of fighting—probably belonged to Asia, not to Greece.

¹ Ὑμέας γὰρ πυνθάνομαι προέσταναι τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Herodot. i. 69): compare i. 152; v. 49; vi. 84, about Spartan hegemony.

² Xenoph. Repub. Lac. 10, 8. ἐπαινοῦσι μὲν πάντες τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπιτηδεύματα, μισεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὰ οὐδεμία πόλις ἐθέλει.

The magnificent funeral discourse, pronounced by Periklēs in the early part of the Peloponnesian war over the deceased Athenian warriors, includes a remarkable contrast of the unconstrained patriotism and bravery of the Athenians, with the austere, repulsive and ostentatious drilling to which the Spartans were

subject from their earliest youth; at the same time it attests the powerful effect which that drilling produced upon the mind of Greece (Thucyd. ii. 37–39). πιστεύοντες οὐ ταῖς παρσκευαῖς τὸ πλεόν καὶ ἀπάταις, ἢ τῷ ἀφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐς τὰ ἔργα εὐψύχῳ καὶ ἐν ταῖς παιδείαις οἱ μὲν (the Spartans) ἐπιτόνῳ ἀσκήσει εὐθὺς νέοι ὄντες τὸ ἀνδρεῖον μετέρχονται, &c.

The impression of the light troops when they first began to attack the Lacedæmonian hoplites in the island of Sphakteria is strongly expressed by Thucydides (iv. 34)—τῇ γνώμῃ δεδουλωμένοι ὥς ἐπὶ Λακεδαιμονίους, &c.

the spear is hurled, when troops seem afraid of coming to close quarters.¹ Nor is it by any means certain, that the Homeric manner of fighting ever really prevailed in Peloponnesus, which is a country eminently inconvenient for the use of war-chariots. The descriptions of the bard may perhaps have been founded chiefly upon what he and his auditors witnessed on the coast of Asia Minor, where chariots were more employed, and where the country was much more favourable to them.² We have no historical knowledge of any military practice in Peloponnesus anterior to the hoplites with close ranks and protended spears.

One Peloponnesian state there was, and one alone, which disdained to acknowledge the superiority or headship of Lacedæmon. Argos never forgot that she had once been the chief power in the peninsula, and her feeling towards Sparta was that of a jealous, but impotent, competitor. By what steps the decline of her power had taken place, we are unable to make out, nor can we trace the succession of her kings subsequent to Pheidôn. It has been already stated that about 669 B.C., the Argeians gained a victory over the Spartans at Hysiæ, and that they expelled from the port of Nauplia its pre-existing inhabitants, who found shelter, by favour of the Lacedæmonians, at the port of Mothônê in Messenia :³ Damokratidas was then king of Argos. Pausanias tells us that Meltas the son of Lakidês was the last descendant of Temenus who succeeded to this dignity ; he being condemned and deposed by the people. Plutarch however states that the family of the Herakleids died out, and that another king, named Ægôn, was chosen by the people at the indication of the Delphian oracle.⁴ Of this story, Pausanias appears to have known nothing. His language implies that the kingly dignity ceased with Meltas—wherein he is undoubtedly mistaken, since the title existed (though probably with very limited functions) at the time of the Persian war. Moreover there is some ground for presuming that the king of Argos was even at that time a Herakleid—since the Spartans offered to him a third part of the command of

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. v. 4, 52 ; compare ii. 5, 20.

² Xenoph. Hellen. iii. 4, 19.

³ Pausan. iv. 24, 2 ; iv. 35, 2.

⁴ Pausan. ii. 19, 2 ; Plutarch (Cur Pythia nunc non reddat oracula, &c. c. 5, p. 396 ; De Fortunâ Alexandri, c. 8, p. 340). Lakidês, king of Argos, is also named by Plutarch as luxurious and effeminate (De capiendâ ab hostibus utilitate, c. 6, p. 89).

O. Müller (Hist. Dorians, iii. 6, 10) identifies Lakidês, son of Meltas, named by Pausanias, with Leôkêdês son of Pheidôn, named by Herodotus as one of the suitors for the daughter of Kleisthenês the Sikyonian (vi. 127) ; and he thus infers that Meltas must have been deposed and succeeded by Ægon, about 560 B.C. This conjecture seems to me not much to be trusted.

the Hellenic force, conjointly with their own two kings.¹ The conquest of Thyreātis by the Spartans deprived the Argeians of a valuable portion of their Periækis, or dependent territory. But Orneæ and the remaining portion of Kynuria² still continued to belong to them: the plain round their city was very productive; and, except Sparta, there was no other power in Peloponnesus superior to them. Mykenæ and Tiryns nevertheless, seem both to have been independent states at the time of the Persian war, since both sent contingents to the battle of Platæa, at a time when Argos held aloof and rather favoured the Persians. At what time Kleônæ became the ally or dependent of Argos, we cannot distinctly make out. During the Peloponnesian war it is numbered in that character along with Orneæ:³ but it seems not to have lost its autonomy about the year 470 B.C., at which period Pindar represents the Kleônæans as presiding and distributing prizes at the Nemean games.⁴ The grove of Nemea was less than two miles from their town, and they were the original presidents of this great festival—a function, of which they were subsequently robbed by the Argeians, in the same manner as the Pisatans had been treated by the Eleians with reference to the Olympic Agôn. The extinction of the autonomy of Kleônæ, and the acquisition of the presidency of the Nemean festival by Argos, were doubtless simultaneous, but we are unable to mark the exact time. For the statement of Eusebius, that the Argeians celebrated the Nemean festival as early as the 53rd Olympiad, or 568 B.C., is contradicted by the more valuable evidence of Pindar.⁵

Of Corinth and Sikyôn it will be more convenient to speak when

¹ Herodot. vii. 149.

² Herodot. viii. 73.

Strabo distinguishes two places called Orneæ; one a village in the Argeian territory, the other a town between Corinth and Sikyôn: but I doubt whether there ever were two places so called: the town or village dependent on Argos seems the only place (Strabo, viii. p. 376).

³ Thucyd. v. 67–vi. 95.

The Kleônæans are also said to have aided the Argeians in the destruction of Mykenæ, conjointly with the Tegeatans: from hence, however, we cannot infer anything as to their dependence at that time (Strabo, viii. p. 377).

⁴ Pindar, Nem. x. 42. Κλεωναίων πρὸς ἀνδρῶν τετράκις (compare Nem. iv. 17). Κλεωναίων τ' ἀπ' ἀγῶνος, &c.

⁵ See Corsini Dissertation. Agonicææ, iii. 2.

The tenth Nemean Ode of Pindar is on this point peculiarly good evidence, inasmuch as it is composed for, and supposed to be sung by Theieus, a native of Argos. Had there been any jealousy then subsisting between Argos and Kleônæ on the subject of the presidency of this festival, Pindar would never on such an occasion have mentioned expressly the Kleônæans as presidents.

The statements of the Scholia on Pindar, that the Corinthians at one time celebrated the Nemean games, or that they were of old celebrated at Sikyôn, seem unfounded (Schol. Pind. Arg. Nem. and Nem. x. 49).

we survey what is called the Age of the Tyrants or Despots ; and of the inhabitants of Achaia (who occupied the southern coast of the Corinthian Gulf, westward of Sikyôn as far as Cape Araxus, the north-western point of Peloponnesus), a few words exhaust our whole knowledge, down to the time at which we are arrived. These Achæans are given to us as representing the ante-Dorian inhabitants of Laconia, whom the legend affirms to have retired under Tisamenus to the northern parts of Peloponnesus, from whence they expelled the pre-existing Ionians and occupied the country. The race of their kings is said to have lasted from Tisamenus down to Ogygus¹—how long we do not know. After the death of the latter, the Achæan towns formed each a separate republic, but with periodical festivals and sacrifice at the temple of Zeus Homarius, affording opportunity of settling differences and arranging their common concerns. Of these towns, twelve are known from Herodotus and Strabo—Pellênê, Ægira, Ægæ, Bura, Helikê, Ægium, Rhypes, Patræ, Pharæ, Olenus, Dymê, Tritæa.² But there must originally have been some other autonomous towns besides these twelve ; for in the 23rd Olympiad, Ikarus of Hyperêsia was proclaimed as victor, and there seems good reason to believe that Hyperêsia, an old town of the Homeric Catalogue, was in Achaia.³ It is affirmed, that before the Achæan occupation of the country, the Ionians had dwelt in independent villages, several of which were subsequently aggregated into towns ; thus Patræ was formed by a coalescence of seven villages, Dymê from eight (one of which was named Teuthea), and Ægium also from seven or eight. But all these towns were small, and some of them underwent a farther junction one with the other ; thus Ægæ was joined with Ægeira, and Olenus with Dymê.⁴ All the authors seem disposed to recognise twelve cities, and no more, in Achaia ; for Polybius, still adhering to that number, substitutes Leontium and Keryneia in place of Ægæ and Rhypes ; Pausanias gives Keryneia in place of Patræ.⁵ We hear of no facts respecting these Achæan towns until a short time before the Peloponnesian war, and even then their part was inconsiderable.

The greater portion of the territory comprised under the name of

¹ Polyb. ii. 41.

² Herodot. i. 145 ; Strabo, viii. p. 385.

³ Pausan. iv. 15, 1 ; Strabo, viii. p. 383 ; Homer, Iliad, ii. 573. Pausanias seems to have forgotten this statement when he tells us that the name of Hyperêsia was exchanged for that of Ægeira,

during the time of the Ionian occupation of the country (vii. 26, 1 ; Steph. Byz. copies him, v. Ἀγείρα). It is doubtful whether the two names designate the same place, nor does Strabo conceive that they did.

⁴ Strabo, viii. p. 337, 342, 386.

⁵ Polyb. ii. 41.

Achaia was mountain, forming the northern descent of those high ranges, passable only through very difficult gorges, which separate the country from Arcadia to the south, and which throw out various spurs approaching closely to the Gulf of Corinth. A strip of flat land, with white clayey soil, often very fertile, between these mountains and the sea, formed *the plain* of each of the Achæan towns, which were situated for the most part upon steep outlying eminences overhanging it. From the mountains between Achaia and Arcadia, numerous streams flow into the Corinthian Gulf, but few of them are perennial, and the whole length of coast is represented as harbourless.¹

¹ See Leake's Travels in Morea, c. xxvii, and xxxi.

CHAPTER IX.

CORINTH, SIKYON, AND MEGARA—AGE OF THE GRECIAN DESPOTS.

I HAVE thus brought down the history of Sparta to the period marked by the reign of Peisistratus at Athens; at which time she had attained her maximum of territory, was confessedly the most powerful state in Greece, and enjoyed a proportionate degree of deference from the rest. I now proceed to touch upon the three Dorian cities on and near to the Isthmus—Corinth, Sikyôn, and Megara, as they existed at this same period.

Even amidst the scanty information which has reached us, we trace the marks of considerable maritime energy and commerce among the Corinthians, as far back as the eighth century B.C. The foundation of Korkyra and Syracuse, in the eleventh Olympiad, or 734 B.C. (of which I shall speak farther in connexion with Grecian colonisation generally), by expeditions from Corinth, affords proof that they knew how to turn to account the excellent situation which connected them with the sea on both sides of Peloponnesus. Moreover Thucydides,¹ while he notices them as the chief liberators of the sea in early times from pirates, also tells us that the first great improvement in ship-building—the construction of the trireme, or ship of war, with a full deck and triple banks for the rowers—was the fruit of Corinthian ingenuity. It was in the year 703 B.C., that the Corinthian Ameinoklês built four triremes for the Samians, the first which those islanders had ever possessed. The notice of this fact attests as well the importance attached to the new invention, as the humble scale on which the naval force in those early days was equipped. And it is a fact of not less moment, in proof of the maritime vigour of Corinth in the seventh century B.C., that the earliest naval battle known to Thucydides was one which took place between the Corinthians and the Korkyræans, B.C. 664.²

It has already been stated that the line of Herakleid kings in Corinth subsides gradually, through a series of empty

¹ Thucyd. i. 13.

² Ibid. i. 13.

names, into the oligarchy denominated Bacchiadæ or Bacchiads, under whom our first historical knowledge of the city begins. The persons so named were all accounted descendants of Hêraklês, and formed the governing caste in the city; intermarrying usually among themselves, and choosing from their own number an annual prytanis, or president, for the administration of affairs. Of their internal government we have no accounts, except the tale respecting Archias the founder of Syracuse,¹ one of their number, who had made himself so detested by an act of brutal violence terminating in the death of the beautiful youth Aktæon, as to be forced to expatriate. That such a man should have been placed in the distinguished post of Ækist of the colony of Syracuse, gives us no favourable idea of the Bacchiad oligarchy: we do not however know upon what original authority the story depends, nor can we be sure that it is accurately recounted. But Corinth under their government had already become a powerful commercial and maritime city.

Megara, the last Dorian state in this direction eastward, and conterminous with Attica at the point where the mountains called Kerata descend to Eleusis and the Thriasian plain, is affirmed to have been originally settled by the Dorians of Corinth, and to have remained for some time a dependency of that city. It is farther said to have been at first merely one of five separate villages—Megara, Heræa, Peiræa, Kynosura, Tripodiskus—inhabited by a kindred population, and generally on friendly terms, yet sometimes distracted by quarrels, and on those occasions carrying on war with a degree of lenity and chivalrous confidence which reverses the proverbial affirmation respecting the sanguinary character of enmities between kindred. Both these two statements are transmitted to us (we know not from what primitive source) as explanatory of certain current phrases:² the

Oligarchy
of the Bac-
chiadæ.

Early con-
dition of
Megara.

¹ Plutarch, *Amator. Narrat.* c. 2, p. 772; Diodor. *Fragm. lib. viii.* p. 26. Alexander Ætolus (*Fragm. i.* 5, ed. Schneidewin), and the Scholiast. ad Apollon. Rhod. iv. 1212, seem to connect this act of outrage with the expulsion of the Bacchiadæ from Corinth, which did not take place until long afterwards.

² The first account seems referred to Dêmôn (a writer on Attic archæology, or what is called an Ἀτθιδόγραφος, whose date is about 280 B.C. See Phanodêmi, Dêmônis, Clitodêmi, atque Istri, Ἀτθιδων, *Fragmenta*, ed. Siebelis, *Prefatio*,

p. viii.—xi). It is given as the explanation of the locution—ὁ Διὸς Κόρινθος. See Schol. ad Pindar. *Nem. vii.* ad finem; Schol. Aristophan. *Ran.* 440: the Corinthians seem to have represented their Eponymous hero as son of Zeus, though other Greeks did not believe them (Pausan. ii. 1, 1). That the Megarians were compelled to come to Corinth for demonstration of mourning on occasion of the decease of any of the members of the Bacchiad oligarchy, is, perhaps, a story copied from the regulation at Sparta regarding the Pericci and Helots (Herodot. vi. 57; Pausan.

author of the latter cannot have agreed with the author of the former in considering the Corinthians as masters of the Megarid, because he represents them as fomenting wars among these five villages for the purpose of acquiring that territory. Whatever may be the truth respecting this alleged early subjection of Megara, we know it¹ in the historical age, and that too as early as the fourteenth Olympiad, only as an independent Dorian city, maintaining the integrity of its territory under its leader Orsippus the famous Olympic runner, against some powerful enemies, probably the Corinthians. It was of no mean consideration, possessing a territory which extended across Mount Geraneia to the Corinthian Gulf, on which the fortified town and port of Pêgæ, belonging to the Megarians, was situated. It was mother of early and distant colonies,—and competent, during the time of Solon, to carry on a protracted contest with the Athenians, for the possession of Salamis; wherein, although the latter were at last victorious, it was not without an intermediate period of ill-success and despair.

Of the early history of Sikyôn, from the period when it became Dorian down to the seventh century B.C., we know nothing. Our first information respecting it, concerns the establishment of the despotism of Orthagoras, about 680-670 B.C. And it is a point deserving of notice, that all the three above-mentioned towns,—Corinth, Sikyôn, and Megara—underwent during the course of this same century a similar change of government. In each of them a despot established himself: Orthagoras in Sikyôn; Kypselus in Corinth; Theagenês in Megara.

Unfortunately we have too little evidence as to the state of things by which this change of government was preceded and brought about, to be able to appreciate fully its bearing. But what draws our attention to it more particularly is, that the like phænomenon seems to have occurred contemporaneously throughout a large number of cities, continental, insular and

iv. 14, 3; Tyrtaeus, Fragm.). Pausanias conceives the victory of the Megarians over the Corinthians, which he saw commemorated in the Megarian *θησαυρὸς* at Olympia, as having taken place before the first Olympiad, when Phorbas was life-archon at Athens: Phorbas is placed by chronologers fifth in the series from Medon son of Codrus (Pausan. i. 39, 4; vi. 19, 9). The early enmity between Corinth and Megara is

alluded to in Plutarch, De Malignitate Herodoti, p. 868, c. 35.

The second story noticed in the text is given by Plutarch, Quæstion. Græc. c. 17, p. 295, in illustration of the meaning of the word *Δορύγευος*.

¹ Pausanias, i. 44, 1, and the epigram upon Orsippus in Boeckh, Corpus Inscript. Gr. No. 1050, with Boeckh's commentary.

colonial, in many different parts of the Grecian world. The period between 650 and 500 B.C. witnessed the rise and downfall of many despots and despotic dynasties, each in its own separate city. During the succeeding interval between 500 and 350 B.C., new despots, though occasionally springing up, become more rare. Political dispute takes another turn, and the question is raised directly and ostensibly between the many and the few—the people and the oligarchy. But in the still later times which follow the battle of Chæroneia, in proportion as Greece, declining in civic not less than in military spirit, is driven to the constant employment of mercenary troops, and humbled by the overruling interference of foreigners—the despot with his standing foreign body-guard becomes again a characteristic of the time; a tendency partially counteracted, but never wholly subdued, by Aratus and the Achæan league of the third century B.C.

It would have been instructive if we had possessed a faithful record of these changes of government in some of the more considerable of the Grecian towns. In the absence of such evidence, we can do little more than collect the brief sentences of Aristotle and others respecting the causes which produced them. For as the like change of government was common, near about the same time, to cities very different in locality, in race of inhabitants, in tastes and habits, and in wealth, it must partly have depended upon certain general causes which admit of being assigned and explained.

Earliest
changes of
government
in Greece.

In a preceding chapter I tried to elucidate the heroic government of Greece, so far as it could be known from the epic poems—a government founded (if we may employ modern phraseology) upon divine right as opposed to the sovereignty of the people, but requiring, as an essential condition, that the king shall possess force, both of body and mind, not unworthy of the exalted breed to which he belongs.¹ In this government the authority, which pervades the whole society, all resides in the king. But on important occasions it is exercised through the forms of publicity: he consults, and even discusses, with the council of chiefs or elders—he communicates after such consultation with the assembled Agora,—who hear and approve, perhaps hear and murmur, but are not understood to exercise an option or to reject. In giving an account of the Lysurgæan system, I remarked that the old primitive Rhethræ (or charters of compact) indicated the existence of these

¹ See a striking passage in Plutarch, *Præcept. Reipubl. Gerend.* c. 5, p. 801.

same elements; a king of superhuman lineage (in this particular case two coordinate kings)—a senate of twenty-eight old men, besides the kings who sat in it—and an Ekklesia or public assembly of citizens, convened for the purpose of approving or rejecting propositions submitted to them, with little or no liberty of discussion. The elements of the heroic government of Greece are thus found to be substantially the same as those existing in the primitive Lycurgean constitution; in both cases the predominant force residing in the kings—and the functions of the senate, still more those of the public assembly, being comparatively narrow and restricted: in both cases the regal authority being upheld by a certain religious sentiment, which tended to exclude rivalry and to ensure submission in the people up to a certain point, in spite of misconduct or deficiency in the reigning individual. Among the principal Epirotic tribes this government subsisted down to the third century B.C.,¹ though some of them had passed out of it, and were in the habit of electing annually a president out of the gens to which the king belonged.

Starting from these points, common to the Grecian heroic government, and to the original Lycurgean system, we find that in the Grecian cities generally the king is replaced by an oligarchy, consisting of a limited number of families—while at Sparta the kingly authority, though greatly curtailed, is never abolished. And the different turn of events at Sparta admits of being partially explained. It so happened that for five centuries neither of the two coordinate lines of Spartan kings was ever without some male representatives, so that the sentiment of divine right, upon which their pre-eminence was founded, always proceeded in an undeviating channel. That sentiment never wholly died out in the tenacious mind of Sparta, but it became sufficiently enfeebled to occasion a demand for guarantees against abuse. If the senate had been a more numerous body, composed of a few principal families, and comprising men of all ages, it might perhaps have extended its powers so much as to absorb those of the king. But a council of twenty-eight very old men, chosen indiscriminately from all Spartan families, was essentially an adjunct and secondary force. It was insufficient even as a restraint upon the king—still less was it competent to become his rival; and it served indirectly even as a support to him, by preventing the formation of any other privileged order powerful enough to be an

Peculiarity
of Sparta.

¹ Plutarch, Pyrrh. c. 5. Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 1.

overmatch for his authority. This insufficiency on the part of the senate was one of the causes which occasioned the formation of the annually renewed Council of Five, called the Ephors; originally a defensive board like the Roman Tribunes, intended as a restraint upon abuse of power in the kings, but afterwards expanding into a paramount and irresponsible Executive Directory. Assisted by endless dissensions between the two coordinate kings, the Ephors encroached upon their power on every side, limited them to certain special functions, and even rendered them accountable and liable to punishment, but never aspired to abolish the dignity. That which the regal authority lost in extent (to borrow the just remark of king Theopompus¹) it gained in durability. The descendants of the twins Eurysthenês and Proklês continued in possession of their double sceptre from the earliest historical times down to the revolutions of Agis III. and Kleomenês III.—generals of the military force, growing richer and richer, and revered as well as influential in the state, though the Directory of Ephors were their superiors. And the Ephors became in time quite as despotic, in reference to internal affairs, as the kings could ever have been before them. For the Spartan mind, deeply possessed with the feelings of command and obedience, remained comparatively insensible to the ideas of control and responsibility, and even averse to that open discussion and censure of public measures or officers, which such ideas imply. We must recollect that the Spartan political constitution was both simplified in its character and aided in its working by the comprehensive range of the Lycurgean discipline, with its rigorous equal pressure upon rich and poor, which averted many of the causes elsewhere productive of sedition—habituating the proudest and most refractory citizen to a life of undeviating obedience—satisfying such demand as existed for system and regularity—rendering Spartan personal habits of life much more equal than even democratical Athens could parallel; but contributing at the same time to engender a contempt for talkers, and a dislike of methodical and prolonged speech, which of itself sufficed to exclude all regular interference of the collective citizens, either in political or judicial affairs.

Such were the facts at Sparta. But in the rest of Greece the primitive heroic government was modified in a very different manner: the people outgrew, much more decidedly, that feeling of divine right and personal reverence

Discontinu-
ance of king-
ship in
Greece gene-
rally.

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 1.

which originally gave authority to the king. Willing submission ceased on the part of the people, and still more on the part of the inferior chiefs; and with it ceased the heroic royalty. Something like a system or constitution came to be demanded.

Of this discontinuance of kingship, so universal in the political march of Hellas, one main cause is doubtless to be sought in the smallness and concentrated residence of each distinct Hellenic society. A single chief, perpetual and unresponsible, was noway essential for the maintenance of union. In modern Europe, for the most part, the different political societies which grew up out of the extinction of the Roman empire embraced each a considerable population and a wide extent of territory. The monarchical form presented itself as the only known means of union between the parts; the only visible and imposing symbol of a national identity. Both the military character of the Teutonic invaders, as well as the traditions of the Roman empire which they dismembered, tended towards the establishment of a monarchical chief. The abolition of his dignity would have been looked upon as equivalent, and would really have been equivalent, to the breaking up of the nation; since the maintenance of a collective union by means of general assemblies was so burdensome, that the kings themselves vainly tried to exact it by force, and representative government was then unknown.

The history of the middle ages—though exhibiting constant resistance on the part of powerful subjects, frequent deposition of individual kings, and occasional changes of dynasty—contains few instances of any attempt to maintain a large political aggregate united without a king, either hereditary or elective. Even towards the close of the last century, at the period when the federal constitution of the United States of America was first formed, many reasoners regarded¹ as an impossibility the application of any other system than the monarchical to a territory of large size and population, so as to combine union of the whole with equal privileges and securities to each of the parts. And it might perhaps be a real impossibility among any rude people, with strong local peculiarities, difficult means of communication, and habits of

¹ See this subject discussed in the admirable collection of letters, called the *Federalist*, written in 1787, during the time when the federal constitution of the United States of America was under discussion—Letters 9, 10, 14, by

Mr. Madison.

“Il est de la nature d’une république (says Montesquieu, *Esprit des Loix*, viii. 16) de n’avoir qu’un petit territoire: sans cela, elle ne peut guère subsister.”

representative government not yet acquired. Hence throughout all the larger nations of mediæval and modern Europe, with few exceptions, the prevailing sentiment has been favourable to monarchy; but wherever any single city or district, or cluster of villages, whether in the plains of Lombardy or in the mountains of Switzerland, has acquired independence—wherever any small fraction has severed itself from the aggregate—the opposite sentiment has been found, and the natural tendency has been towards some modification of republican government;¹ out of which indeed, as in Greece, a despot has often been engendered, but always through some unnatural mixture of force and fraud. The feudal system, evolved out of the disordered state of Europe between the eighth and thirteenth centuries, always presumed a permanent suzerain, vested with large rights of a mixed personal and proprietary character over his vassals, though subject also to certain obligations towards them: the immediate vassals of the king had subordinate vassals of their own, to whom they stood in the same relation: and in this hierarchy² of power, property, and territory blended together, the rights of the chief, whether king, duke, or baron, were conceived as constituting a status apart, and neither conferred originally by the grant, nor revocable at the pleasure of those over whom they were exercised. This view of the essential nature of political authority was a point in which the three great elements of modern European society—the Teutonic, the Roman, and the Christian—all concurred, though each in a different way

¹ David Hume, in his Essay XV. (vol. i. p. 159, ed. 1760, after remarking “that all kinds of government, free and despotic, seem to have undergone in modern times (*i. e.* as compared with ancient) a great change to the better, with regard both to foreign and domestic management,” proceeds to say:—

“But though all kinds of government be improved in modern times, yet monarchical government seems to have made the greatest advances towards perfection. It may now be affirmed of civilized monarchies, what was formerly said in praise of republics alone, that they are a government of laws, not of men. They are found susceptible of order, method, and constancy to a surprising degree. Property is there secure; industry encouraged; the arts flourish; and the prince lives secure among his subjects, like a father among his children. There are perhaps, and have been for two centuries, near two

hundred absolute princes, great and small, in Europe; and allowing twenty years to each reign, we may suppose that there have been in the whole two thousand monarchs or tyrants, as the Greeks would have called them; yet of these there has not been one, not even Philip II. of Spain, so bad as Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Domitian, who were four in twelve amongst the Roman emperors. It must however be confessed, that though monarchical governments have approached nearer to popular ones in gentleness and stability, they are still much inferior. Our modern education and customs instil more humanity and moderation than the ancient, but have not as yet been able to overcome entirely the disadvantages of that form of government.”

² See the Lectures of M. Guizot, Cours d'Histoire Moderne, Leçon 30, vol. iii. p. 187, edit. 1829.

and with different modifications; and the result was, a variety of attempts on the part of subjects to compromise with their chief, without any idea of substituting a delegated executive in his place. On particular points of these feudal monarchies there grew up gradually towns with a concentrated population, among whom was seen the remarkable combination of a republican feeling, demanding collective and responsible management in their own local affairs, with a necessity of union and subordination towards the great monarchical whole; and hence again arose a new force tending both to maintain the form, and to predetermine the march, of kingly government.¹ And it has been found in practice possible to attain this latter object—to combine regal government with fixity of administration, equal law impartially executed, security to person and property, and freedom of discussion under representative forms,—in a degree which the wisest ancient Greek would have deemed hopeless.² Such an improvement in the practical working of this species of government, speaking always comparatively with the kings of ancient times in Syria, Egypt, Judæa, the Grecian cities, and Rome,—coupled with the increased force of all

¹ M. Augustin Thierry observes, *Lettres sur l'Histoire de France*, Lettre xvi. p. 235:

“Sans aucun souvenir de l'histoire Grecque ou Romaine, les bourgeois des onzième et douzième siècles, soit que leur ville fût sous la seigneurie d'un roi, d'un comte, d'un duc, d'une évêque ou d'une abbaye, allaient droit à la république; mais la réaction du pouvoir établi les rejetait souvent en arrière. Du balancement de ces deux forces opposées résultait pour la ville une sorte de gouvernement mixte, et c'est ce qui arriva, en général, dans le nord de la France, comme le prouvent les chartes de commune.”

Even among the Italian cities, which became practically self-governing, and produced despots as many in number and as unprincipled in character as the Grecian (I shall touch upon this comparison more largely hereafter), Mr. Hallam observes, that “the sovereignty of the emperors, though not very effective, was in theory always admitted: their name was used in public acts and appeared upon the coin.”—*View of the Middle Ages*, Part I. ch. 3. p. 346, sixth edit.

See also M. Raynouard, *Histoire du Droit Municipal en France*, Book iii. ch. 12. vol. ii. p. 156: “Cette séparation

essentielle et fondamentale entre les actes, les agens du gouvernement—et les actes, les agens de l'administration locale pour les affaires locales—cette démarcation politique, dont l'empire Romain avoit donné l'exemple, et qui concilioit le gouvernement monarchique avec une administration populaire—continua plus ou moins expressément sous les trois dynasties.”

M. Raynouard presses too far his theory of the continuous preservation of the municipal powers in towns from the Roman empire down to the third French dynasty; but into this question it is not necessary for my purpose to enter.

² In reference to the Italian republics of the middle ages, M. Sismondi observes, speaking of Philip della Torre, denominated *signor* by the people of Como, Vercelli and Bergamo, “Dans ces villes, non plus que dans celles que son frère s'était auparavant assujetties, le peuple ne croyoit point renoncer à sa liberté: il n'avoit point voulu choisir un maître, mais seulement un protecteur contre les nobles, un capitaine des gens de guerre, et un chef de la justice. L'expérience lui apprit trop tard, que ces prérogatives réunies constituoient un souverain.”—*Républiques Italiennes*, vol. iii. ch. 20. p. 273.

established routine, and the greater durability of all institutions and creeds which have once obtained footing throughout any wide extent of territory and people—has caused the monarchical sentiment to remain predominant in the European mind (though not without vigorous occasional dissent) throughout the increased knowledge and the enlarged political experience of the last two centuries.

It is important to show that the monarchical institutions and monarchical tendencies prevalent throughout mediæval and modern Europe have been both generated and perpetuated by causes peculiar to those societies, whilst in the Hellenic societies such causes had no place—in order that we may approach Hellenic phænomena in the proper spirit, and with an impartial estimate of the feeling universal among Greeks towards the idea of a king. The primitive sentiment entertained towards the heroic king died out, passing first into indifference, next—after experience of the despots—into determined antipathy.

To an historian like Mr. Mitford, full of English ideas respecting government, this anti-monarchical feeling appears of the nature of insanity, and the Grecian communities like madmen without a keeper: while the greatest of all benefactors is the hereditary king who conquers them from without—the second best is the home despot who seizes the acropolis and puts his fellow-citizens under coercion. There cannot be a more certain way of misinterpreting and distorting Grecian phænomena than to read them in this spirit, which reverses the maxims both of prudence and morality current in the ancient world. The hatred of kings as it stood among the Greeks (whatever may be thought about a similar feeling now) was a pre-eminent virtue, flowing directly from the noblest and wisest part of their nature. It was a consequence of their deep conviction of the necessity of universal legal restraint; it was a direct expression of that regulated sociality which required the control of individual passion from every one without exception, and most of all from him to whom power was confided. The conception which the Greeks formed of an irresponsible One, or of a king who could do no wrong, may be expressed in the pregnant words of Herodotus:¹ “He subverts the customs of the country: he violates women: he puts men to death without trial.” No other conception of the probable tendencies of kingship was justified either by a general knowledge of human

Anti-monarchical sentiment of Greece—
Mr. Mitford.

¹ Herod. iii. 80. *Νομᾶὶ δὲ τε κινεῖ πατρία, καὶ βιάται γυναῖκας, κτείνει τε ἀκρίτους.*

nature, or by political experience as it stood from Solon downward : no other feeling than abhorrence could be entertained for the character so conceived : no other than a man of unprincipled ambition would ever seek to invest himself with it.

Our larger political experience has taught us to modify this opinion, by showing that under the conditions of monarchy in the best governments of modern Europe the enormities described by Herodotus do not take place—and that it is possible, by means of representative constitutions acting under a certain force of manners, customs, and historical recollection, to obviate many of the mischiefs likely to flow from proclaiming the duty of peremptory obedience to an hereditary and irresponsible king, who cannot be changed without extra-constitutional force. But such larger observation was not open to Aristotle, the wisest as well as the most cautious of ancient theorists ; nor if it had been open, could he have applied with assurance its lessons to the governments of the single cities of Greece. The theory of a constitutional king, especially, as it exists in England, would have appeared to him impracticable : to establish a king who will reign without governing—in whose name all government is carried on, yet whose personal will is in practice of little or no effect—exempt from all responsibility, without making use of the exemption—receiving from every one unmeasured demonstrations of homage, which are never translated into act except within the bounds of a known law—surrounded with all the paraphernalia of power, yet acting as a passive instrument in the hands of ministers marked out for his choice by indications which he is not at liberty to resist. This remarkable combination of the fiction of superhuman grandeur and licence with the reality of an invisible strait-waistcoat, is what an Englishman has in his mind when he speaks of a constitutional king. The events of our history have brought it to pass in England, amidst an aristocracy the most powerful that the world has yet seen—but we have still to learn whether it can be made to exist elsewhere, or whether the occurrence of a single king, at once able, aggressive, and resolute, may not suffice to break it up. To Aristotle, certainly, it could not have appeared otherwise than unintelligible and impracticable : not likely even in a single case—but altogether inconceivable as a permanent system and with all the diversities of temper inherent in the successive members of an hereditary dynasty. When the Greeks thought of a man exempt from legal responsibility, they conceived him as really and truly such, in deed as well as in name, with a defenceless community

exposed to his oppressions; and their fear and hatred of him was measured by their reverence for a government of equal law and free speech,¹ with the ascendancy of which their whole hopes of security were associated,—in the democracy of Athens more perhaps than in any other portion of Greece. And this feeling, as it was one of the best in the Greek mind, so it was also one of the most widely spread,—a point of unanimity highly valuable amidst so many points of dissension. We cannot construe or criticise it by reference to the feelings of modern Europe, still less to the very peculiar feelings of England, respecting kingship: and it is the application, sometimes explicit and sometimes tacit, of this unsuitable standard, which renders Mr. Mitford's appreciation of Greek politics so often incorrect and unfair.

When we try to explain the course of Grecian affairs, not from the circumstances of other societies, but from those of the Greeks themselves, we shall see good reason for the discontinuance as well as for the dislike of kingship. Had the Greek mind been as stationary and unimproving as that of the Orientals, the discontent with individual kings might have led to no other change than the deposition of a bad king in favour of one who promised to be better, without ever extending the views of the people to any higher conception than that of a personal government. But the Greek mind was of a progressive character, capable of conceiving and gradually of realizing amended social combinations. Moreover it is in the nature of things that any government—regal, oligarchical or democratical—which comprises only a single city, is far less stable than if it embraced a wider surface and a larger population. When that semi-religious and mechanical submission, which made up for the personal deficiencies

Causes which led to the growth of that sentiment.

¹ Euripides (Supplices, 429) states plainly the idea of a *τύραννος*, as received in Greece; the antithesis to laws:—

Οὐδὲν τυράννον δυσμενέστερον πόλει·
Ὅπου, τὸ μὲν πρότιστον, οὐκ εἰσιν νόμοι
Κοινοί, κρατεῖ δ' εἰς, τὸν νόμον κεκτημένος
Λύττος παρ' αὐτῷ.

Compare Soph. *Antigon.* 737. See also the discussion in *Aristot. Polit.* iii. sect. 10 and 11, in which the rule of the king is discussed in comparison with the government of laws; compare also iv. 8, 2-3. The person called "a king according to law" is, in his judgement, no king at all: 'Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ νόμον λεγόμενος

βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος καθάπερ εἴπομεν βασιλείας (iii. 11, 1).

Respecting *ἰσονομίη*, *ἰσηγορίη*, *παρρησία*—equal laws and equal speech—as opposed to monarchy, see *Herodot.* iii. 142, v. 78-92; *Thucyd.* iii. 62; *Demosthen.* ad *Leptin.* c. 6. p. 461; *Eurip.* *Ion.* 671.

Of *Timoleon* it was stated, as a part of the grateful vote passed after his death by the Syracusan assembly—*ὅτι τοὺς τυράννους καταλύσας, — ἀπέδωκε τοὺς νόμους τοῖς Σικελιώταις.* (*Plutarch.* *Timoleon*, c. 39.)

See *Karl Fried. Hermann, Griech. Staats Alterthümer*, sect. 61-65.

of the heroic king, became too feeble to serve as a working principle, the petty prince was in too close contact with his people, and too humbly furnished out in every way, to get up a prestige or delusion of any other kind. He had no means of overawing their imaginations by that combination of pomp, seclusion, and mystery, which Herodotus and Xenophon so well appreciate among the artifices of kingcraft.¹ As there was no new feeling upon which a perpetual chief could rest his power, so there was nothing in the circumstances of the community which rendered the maintenance of such a dignity necessary for visible and effective union.² In a single city, and a small circumjacent community, collective deliberation and general rules, with temporary and responsible magistrates, were practicable without difficulty.

To maintain an irresponsible king, and then to contrive accompaniments which shall extract from him the benefits of responsible government, is in reality a highly complicated system, though, as has been remarked, we have become familiar with it in modern Europe. The more simple and obvious change is, to substitute one or more temporary and responsible magistrates in place of the king himself. Such was the course which affairs took in Greece. The inferior chiefs, who had originally served as council to the king, found it possible to supersede him, and to alternate the functions of administration among themselves; retaining probably the occasional convocation of the general assembly, as it had existed before, and with as little practical efficacy. Such was in substance the character of that mutation which occurred generally throughout the Grecian states, with the exception of Sparta: kingship was abolished, and an oligarchy took its place — a council deliberating collectively, deciding general matters by the majority of voices, and selecting some individuals of their own body as temporary and accountable administrators. It was always an oligarchy which arose on the defeasance of the heroic kingdom. The age of democratical movement was yet far distant, and the condition of the people—the general body of freemen—was not immediately altered, either for better or worse, by

Change to
oligarchical
government.

¹ See the account of Deïokês the first Median king in Herodotus, i. 99, evidently an outline drawn by Grecian imagination: also the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon, viii. 1, 40; viii. 3, 1-14; vii. 5, 37 . . . οὐ τοῦτω μόνῳ ἐνόμιζε (Κῶρος) χρῆναι τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν ἀρχομένων διαφέρειν τῷ βελτίονας αὐτῶν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταγοητεύειν ἕξτεο χρῆναι

αὐτοὺς, &c.

² David Hume, *Essay* xvii. On the Rise and Progress of the Arts and Sciences, p. 198, ed. 1760. The effects of the greater or less extent of territory, upon the nature of the government, are also well discussed in Destutt Tracy, *Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Loix* de Montesquieu, ch. viii.

the revolution. The small number of privileged persons, among whom the kingly attributes were distributed and put in rotation, were those nearest in rank to the king himself; perhaps members of the same large gens with him, and pretending to a common divine or heroic descent. As far as we can make out, this change seems to have taken place in the natural course of events and without violence. Sometimes the kingly lineage died out and was not replaced; sometimes, on the death of a king, his son and successor was acknowledged¹ only as archon—or perhaps set aside altogether to make room for a Prytanis or president out of the men of rank around.

At Athens, we are told that Kodrus was the last king, and that his descendants were recognised only as archons for life. After some years, the archons for life were replaced by archons for ten years, taken from the body of Eupatridæ or nobles; subsequently, the duration of the archonship was further shortened to one year. At Corinth, the ancient kings are said to have passed in like manner into the oligarchy of the Bacchiadæ, out of whom an annual Prytanis was chosen. We are only able to make out the general fact of such a change, without knowing how it was brought about—our first historical acquaintance with the Grecian cities beginning with these oligarchies.

Such oligarchical governments, varying in their details but analogous in general features, were common throughout the cities of Greece Proper as well as of the colonies, throughout the seventh century B.C. Though they had little immediate tendency to benefit the mass of the freemen, yet when we compare them with the antecedent heroic government, they indicate an important advance—the first adoption of a deliberate and preconceived system in the management of public affairs.² They exhibit the first evidences of new and important

Such change indicates an advance in the Greek mind.

¹ Aristot. Polit. iii. 9-7; iii. 10, 7-8.

M. Augustin Thierry remarks, in a similar spirit, that the great political change, common to so large a portion of mediæval Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, whereby the many different *communes* or city constitutions were formed, was accomplished under great varieties of manner and circumstances; sometimes by violence, sometimes by harmonious accord.

“C’est une controverse qui doit finir, que celle des franchises municipales obtenues par l’insurrection et des franchises municipales accordées. Quelque

face du problème qu’on envisage, il reste bien entendu que les constitutions urbaines du xii. et du xiii. siècle, comme toute espèce d’institutions politiques dans tous les temps, ont pu s’établir à force ouverte, s’octroyer de guerre lasse ou de plein gré, être arrachées ou sollicitées, vendues ou données gratuitement: les grandes révolutions sociales s’accomplissent par tous ces moyens à la fois.”—(Aug. Thierry, *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, Préface, p. 19, 2de édit.)

² Aristot. Polit. iii. 10, 7. Ἐπεὶ δὲ (i. e. after the early kings had had their

political ideas in the Greek mind—the separation of legislative and executive powers; the former vested in a collective body, not merely deliberating but also finally deciding—while the latter is confided to temporary individual magistrates, responsible to that body at the end of their period of office. We are first introduced to a community of citizens, according to the definition of Aristotle—men qualified, and thinking themselves qualified, to take turns in command and obedience. The collective sovereign, called The City, is thus constituted. It is true that this first community of citizens comprised only a small proportion of the men personally free; but the ideas upon which it was founded began gradually to dawn upon the minds of all. Political power had lost its heaven-appointed character, and had become an attribute legally communicable as well as determined to certain definite ends: and the ground was thus laid for those thousand questions which agitated so many of the Grecian cities during the ensuing three centuries, partly respecting its apportionment, partly respecting its employment,—questions sometimes raised among the members of the privileged oligarchy itself, sometimes between that order as a whole and the non-privileged Many. The seeds of those popular movements, which called forth so much profound emotion, so much bitter antipathy, so much energy and talent, throughout the Grecian world, with different modifications in each particular city, may thus be traced back to that early revolution which erected the primitive oligarchy upon the ruins of the heroic kingdom.

How these first oligarchies were administered we have no direct information. But the narrow and anti-popular interests naturally belonging to a privileged few, together with the general violence of private manners and passions, leave us no ground for presuming favourably respecting either their prudence or their good feeling; and the facts which we learn respecting the condition of Attica prior to the Solonian legislation (to be recounted in the next chapter) raise inferences all of an unfavourable character.

The first shock which they received, and by which so many of them were subverted, arose from the usurpers called Despots, who employed the prevalent discontents both as pretexts and as aids

δα) συνέβαινε γίνεσθαι πολλοὺς ὁμοίους πρὸς ἀρετὴν, οὐκετι ὑπέμενον (τὴν βασιλείαν) ἀλλ' ἐζήτουν κοινόν τι, καὶ πολιτείαν καθίστασαν.

Κοινόν τι, a *commune*, the great object for which the European towns in the

middle ages, in the twelfth century, struggled with so much energy, and ultimately obtained: a charter of incorporation, and a qualified privilege of internal self-government.

for their own personal ambition, while their very frequent success seems to imply that such discontents were wide spread as well as serious. These despots arose out of the bosom of the oligarchies, but not all in the same manner.¹ Sometimes the executive magistrate, upon whom the oligarchy themselves had devolved important administrative powers for a certain temporary period, became unfaithful to his choosers, and acquired sufficient ascendancy to retain his dignity permanently in spite of them—perhaps even to transmit it to his son. In other places, and seemingly more often, there arose that noted character called the Demagogue, of whom historians both ancient and modern commonly draw so repulsive a picture:² a man of energy and ambition, sometimes even a member of the oligarchy itself, who stood forward as champion of the grievances and sufferings of the non-privileged Many, acquired their favour, and employed their strength so effectively as to put down the oligarchy by force, and constitute himself despot. A third form of despot, some presumptuous wealthy man, like Kylôn at Athens, without even the pretence of popularity, was occasionally emboldened, by the success of similar adventurers in other places, to hire a troop of retainers and seize the acropolis. And there were examples, though rare, of a fourth variety—the lineal descendant of the ancient kings—who, instead of suffering himself to be restricted or placed under control by the oligarchy, found means to subjugate them, and to extort by force an ascendancy as great as that which his forefathers had enjoyed by consent. To these must be added, in several Grecian states, the *Æsymnête* or Dictator, a citizen formally invested with supreme and irresponsible power, placed in command of the military force, and armed with a standing body-guard, but only for a time named, and in order to deal with some urgent peril or ruinous internal dissension.³ The person thus exalted, always enjoying a large measure

¹ The definition of a despot is given in Cornelius Nepos, Vit. Miltiadis, c. 8:—"Omnes habentur et dicuntur tyranni, qui potestate sunt perpetuâ in eâ civitate, quæ libertate usa est:" compare Cicero de Republicâ, ii. 26, 27; iii. 14.

The word *τύραννος* was said by Hippias the sophist to have first found its way into the Greek language about the time of Archilochus (B.C. 660); Boeckh thinks that it came from the Lydians or Phrygians (Comment. ad Corp. Inscription. No. 3439).

² Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 2, 3, 4. *Τύραν-*

νος—ἐκ προστατικής ῥίξης καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἐκβλαστάνει (Plato. Repub. viii. c. 17. p. 565). Οὐδενὶ γὰρ δὴ ἄδελον, ὅτι πᾶς τύραννος ἐκ δημοκόλακος φύεται (Dionys. Halic. vi. 60): a proposition decidedly too general.

³ Aristot. iii. 9, 5; iii. 10, 1–10; iv. 8. 2. Αἰσυνῆται—αὐτοκράτορες μόναραχοι ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις "Ἑλλήσι—αἰρετὴ τυραννίς: compare Theophrastus, Fragment. περὶ βασιλείας, and Dionys. Hal. A. R. v. 73–74; Strabo, xiii. p. 617; and Aristot. Fragment. Rerum Publicarum, ed. Neumann, p. 122, *Κυμῶων Πολιτεία*.

of confidence, and generally a man of ability, was sometimes so successful, or made himself so essential to the community, that the term of his office was prolonged, and he became practically despot for life; or even if the community were not disposed to concede to him this permanent ascendancy, he was often strong enough to keep it against their will.

Such were the different modes in which the numerous Greek
Examples. despots of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. acquired their power. Though we know thus much in general terms from the brief statements of Aristotle, yet unhappily we have no contemporary picture of any one of these communities, so as to give us the means of appreciating the change in detail. Of the persons who, possessing inherited kingly dignity, stretched their paternal power so far as to become despots, Aristotle gives us Phêidon of Argos as an example, whose reign has been already narrated. Of those who made themselves despots by means of official power previously held under an oligarchy, he names Phalaris at Agrigentum and the despots at Miletus and other cities of the Ionic Greeks: among others who raised themselves by becoming demagogues, he specifies Panætiûs in the Sicilian town of Leontini, Kypselus at Corinth, and Peisistratus at Athens:¹ of *Æsymnêtes* or chosen despots, Pittakus of Mitylênê is the prominent instance. The military and aggressive demagogue, subverting an oligarchy which had degraded and ill-used him, governing as a cruel despot for several years, and at last dethroned and slain, is farther depicted by Dionysius of Halikar-nassus in the history of Aristodêmus of the Italian Cumæ.²

From the general statement of Thucydides as well as of Aris-
Tendency towards a better organised citizenship. totle, we learn that the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. were centuries of progress for the Greek cities generally, in wealth, in power, and in population; and the numerous colonies founded during this period (of which I shall speak in a future chapter) will furnish further illustration of such progressive tendencies. Now the changes just mentioned in the Grecian governments, imperfectly as we know them, are on the whole decided evidences of advancing citizenship. For the heroic government, with which Grecian communities begin, is the rudest and most infantine of all governments: destitute even of the pretence of

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 2, 3, 4; v. 4, 5. Aristotle refers to one of the songs of Alkæus as his evidence respecting the elevation of Pittakus: a very sufficient proof doubtless—but we may see that

he had no other informants, except the poets, about these early times.

² Dionys. Hal. A. R. vii. 2, 12. The reign of Aristodemus falls about 510 B.C.

system or security, incapable of being in any way foreknown, and depending only upon the accidental variations in the character of the reigning individual, who in most cases, far from serving as a protection to the poor against the rich and great, was likely to indulge his passions in the same unrestrained way as the latter, and with still greater impunity.

The despots, who in so many towns succeeded and supplanted this oligarchical government, though they governed on principles usually narrow and selfish, and often oppressively cruel, “taking no thought (to use the emphatic words of Thucydides) except each for his own body and his own family”—yet since they were not strong enough to crush the Greek mind, imprinted upon it a painful but improving political lesson, and contributed much to enlarge the range of experience as well as to determine the subsequent cast of feeling.¹ They partly broke down the wall of distinction between the people—properly so called, the general mass of freemen—and the oligarchy: indeed the demagogue-despots are interesting as the first evidence of the growing importance of the people in political affairs. The demagogue stood forward as representing the feelings and interests of the people against the governing few, probably availing himself of some special cases of ill-usage, and taking pains to be conciliatory and generous in his own personal behaviour. When the people by their armed aid had enabled him to overthrow the existing rulers, they had thus the satisfaction of seeing their own chief in possession of the supreme power, but they acquired neither political rights nor increased securities for themselves. What measure of positive advantage they may have reaped, beyond that of seeing their previous oppressors humiliated, we know too little to determine.² But even the worst of despots was more formidable to the rich than to the poor; and the latter may perhaps have gained by the change, in comparative importance, notwithstanding their share in the rigours and exactions of a government which had no other permanent foundation than naked fear.

Character
and working
of the
despots.

A remark made by Aristotle deserves especial notice here, as

¹ Thucyd. i. 17. Τύραννοι δὲ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς Ἑλληνικαῖς πόλεσι, τὸ ἐφ' αὐτῶν μόνον προορώμενοι ἔς τε τὸ σώμα καὶ ἔς τὸ τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον αὔξειν δι' ἀσφαλείας ὅσον ἐδύναντο μάλιστα, τὰς πόλεις φκουν.

² Wachsmuth (Hellenische Aterthums-kunde, sect. 49–51) and Tittmann

(Griechisch. Staatsverfassungen, p. 527–533) both make too much of the supposed friendly connexion and mutual goodwill between the despot and the poorer freemen. Community of antipathy against the old oligarchy was a bond essentially temporary, dissolved as soon as that oligarchy was put down.

illustrating the political advance and education of the Grecian communities. He draws a marked distinction between the early demagogue of the seventh and sixth centuries, and the later demagogue, such as he himself, and the generations immediately preceding, had witnessed. The former was a military chief, daring and full of resource, who took arms at the head of a body of popular insurgents, put down the government by force, and made himself the master both of those whom he deposed and of those by whose aid he deposed them; while the latter was a speaker, possessed of all the talents necessary for moving an audience, but neither inclined to, nor qualified for, armed attack—accomplishing all his purposes by pacific and constitutional methods. This valuable change—substituting discussion and the vote of an assembly in place of an appeal to arms, and procuring for the pronounced decision of the assembly such an influence over men's minds as to render it final and respected even by dissentients—arose from the continued practical working of democratical institutions. I shall have occasion, at a later period of this history, to estimate the value of that unmeasured obloquy which has been heaped on the Athenian demagogues of the Peloponnesian war—Kleôn and Hyperbolus; but assuming the whole to be well-founded, it will not be the less true that these men were a material improvement on the earlier demagogues such as Kypselus and Peisistratus, who employed the armed agency of the people for the purpose of subverting the established government and acquiring despotic authority for themselves. The demagogue was essentially a leader of opposition, who gained his influence by denouncing the men in real ascendancy, and in actual executive functions. Now under the early oligarchies his opposition could be shown only by armed insurrection, and it conducted him either to personal sovereignty or to destruction. But the growth of democratical institutions ensured both to him and to his political opponents full liberty of speech, and a paramount assembly to determine between them; whilst it both limited the range of his ambition, and set aside the appeal to armed force. The railing demagogue of Athens at the time of the Peloponnesian war (even if we accept literally the representations of his worst enemies) was thus a far less mischievous and dangerous person than the fighting demagogue of the earlier centuries; and the “growth of habits of public speaking”¹ (to use

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 4, 4; 7, 3. Ἐπὶ | δημαγωγὸς καὶ στρατηγός, εἰς τυραννίδα
δὲ τῶν ἀρχαίων, ὅτε γένοιτο ὁ αὐτός | μετέβαλλον σχεδὸν γὰρ οἱ πλείστοι τῶν

Aristotle's expression) was the cause of the difference. Opposition by the tongue was a beneficial substitute for opposition by the sword.

The rise of these despots on the ruins of the previous oligarchies was, in appearance, a return to the principles of the heroic age—the restoration of a government of personal will in place of that systematic arrangement known as the City. But the Greek mind had so far outgrown those early principles, that no new government founded thereupon could meet with willing acquiescence, except under some temporary excitement. At first doubtless the popularity of the usurper—combined with the fervour of his partisans and the expulsion or intimidation of opponents, and further enhanced by the punishment of rich oppressors—was sufficient to procure for him obedience; and prudence on his part might prolong this undisputed rule for a considerable period, perhaps even throughout his whole life. But Aristotle intimates that these governments, even when they began well, had a constant tendency to become worse and worse. Discontent manifested itself, and was aggravated rather than repressed by the violence employed against it, until at length the despot became a prey to mistrustful and malevolent anxiety, losing any measure of equity or benevolent sympathy which might once have animated him. If he was fortunate enough to bequeath his authority to his son, the latter, educated in a corrupt atmosphere and surrounded by parasites, contracted dispositions yet more noxious and unsocial. His youthful appetites were more ungovernable, while he was deficient in the prudence and vigour which had been indispensable to the self-accomplished rise of his father.¹ For such a position, mercenary guards and a fortified acropolis were the only stay—guards fed at the expense of the citizens, and thus requiring constant exactions on behalf of that which was nothing better than a hostile garrison. It was essential to the security of the despot that he should keep down the spirit of the free people whom he governed; that he should isolate them from each other, and prevent those meetings and mutual communications which

Contrast between the despot and the early heroic king. Position of the despot.

ἀρχαίων τυράννων ἐκ δημαγωγῶν γεγόνασι. Αἷτιον δὲ τοῦ τότε μὲν γενέσθαι, νῦν δὲ μὴ, ὅτι τότε μὲν, οἱ δημαγωγοὶ ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν στρατηγούντων· οὐ γὰρ πῶς δεινοὶ ἦσαν λέγειν· νῦν δὲ, τῆς ῥητορικῆς ἡὔξη- μένης, οἱ δυνάμενοι λέγειν δημαγωγοῦσι μὲν, δι' ἀπειρίαν δὲ τῶν πολεμικῶν οὐκ ἐπιτίθενται, πλὴν εἴ ποῦ βραχύ τι γέγονε τοιοῦτον.

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 20. The whole tenor of this eighth chapter (of the fifth book) shows how unrestrained were the personal passions—the lust as well as the anger—of a Grecian τύραννος.

Τὸν τοι τύραννον εὖσεβεῖν οὐ βῆδιον (Sophokles ap. Schol. Aristides, vol. iii. p. 291, ed. Dindorf).

Grecian cities habitually presented in the School, the Leschê, or the Palæstra; that he should strike off the overtopping ears of corn in the field (to use the Greek locution) or crush the exalted and enterprising minds.¹ Nay, he had even to a certain extent an interest in degrading and impoverishing them, or at least in debarring them from the acquisition either of wealth or leisure. The extensive constructions undertaken by Polykratês at Samos, as well as the rich donations of Periander to the temple at Olympia, are considered by Aristotle to have been extorted by these despots with the express view of engrossing the time and exhausting the means of their subjects.

It is not to be imagined that all were alike cruel or unprincipled. But the perpetual supremacy of one man or one family had become so offensive to the jealousy of those who felt themselves to be his equals, and to the general feeling of the people, that repression and severity were inevitable, whether originally intended or not. And even if an usurper, having once entered upon this career of violence, grew sick and averse to its continuance, abdication only left him in imminent peril, exposed to the vengeance² of those whom he had injured—unless indeed he could clothe himself with the mantle of religion, and stipulate with the people to become priest of some temple and deity; in which case his new function protected him, just as the tonsure and the mo-

Good government impossible to him.

¹ Aristot. Polit. iii. 8, 3; v. 8, 7. Herodot. v. 92. Herodotus gives the story as if Thrasybulus had been the person to suggest this hint by conducting the messenger of Periander into a corn-field and there striking off the tallest ears with his stick: Aristotle reverses the two, and makes Periander the adviser: Livy (i. 54) transfers the scene to Gabii and Romê, with Sextus Tarquinius as the person sending for counsel to his father at Rome. Compare Plato, Republ. viii. c. 17. p. 565; Eurip. Supplic. 444–455.

The discussion which Herodotus ascribes to the Persian conspirators, after the assassination of the Magian king, whether they should constitute the Persian government as a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a democracy, exhibits a vein of ideas purely Grecian, and altogether foreign to the Oriental conception of government. But it sets forth—briefly, yet with great perspicuity and penetration—the advantages and disadvantages of all the three. The case

made out against monarchy is by far the strongest, while the counsel on behalf of monarchy assumes as a part of his case that the individual monarch is to be the best man in the state. The anti-monarchical champion Otanes concludes a long string of criminations against the despot with these words above-noticed,—“He subverts the customs of the country: he violates women: he puts men to death untried.” (Herod. iii. 80–82).

² Thucyd. ii. 63. Compare again the speech of Kleon, iii. 37–40—*ὡς τυραννίδα γὰρ ἔχετε αὐτήν, ἣν λαβεῖν μὲν ἄδικον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἀφεῖναι δὲ ἐπικίνδυνον*.

The bitter sentiment against despots seems to be as old as Alkæus, and we find traces of it in Solon and Theognis (Theognis, 38–50; Solon, Fragm. vii. p. 32, ed. Schneidewin). Phanias of Ereus had collected in a book the “Assassinations of Despots from revenge” (*Τυράννων ἀναίρεσις ἐκ τιμωρίας*—Athenæus, iii. p. 90; x. p. 438).

nastery sheltered a dethroned prince in the middle ages.¹ Several of the despots were patrons of music and poetry, courting the goodwill of contemporary intellectual men by invitation as well as by reward. Moreover there were some cases, such as that of Peisistratus and his sons at Athens, in which an attempt was made (analogous to that of Augustus at Rome) to reconcile the reality of personal omnipotence with a certain respect for pre-existing forms.² In such instances the administration—though not unstained by guilt, never otherwise than unpopular, and carried on by means of foreign mercenaries—was doubtless practically milder. But cases of this character were rare; and the maxims usual with Grecian despots were personified in Periander the Kypselid of Corinth—a harsh and brutal person, though not destitute either of vigour or intelligence.

The position of a Grecian despot, as depicted by Plato, by Xenophon and by Aristotle,³ and farther sustained by the indications in

¹ See the story of Mæandrius, minister and successor of Polykratēs of Samos, in Herodotus, iii. 142, 143.

² Thucyd. vi. 54. The epitaph of Archedikē, the daughter of Hippias (which was inscribed at Lampsakus, where she died), though written by a great friend of Hippias, conveys the sharpest implied invective against the usual proceedings of the despots:—

Ἡ πατὴρ τε καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀδελφῶν τ' οὐσα
τυράννων
Παιδὼν τ', οὐχ ἥρθη νοῦν ἐς ἀτασθαλίην.
(Thuc. vi. 59.)

The position of Augustus at Rome, and of Peisistratus at Athens, may be illustrated by a passage in Sismondi, *Républiques Italiennes*, vol. iv. ch. 26. p. 208:—

“Les petits monarques de chaque ville s'opposaient eux-mêmes à ce que leur pouvoir fût attribué à un droit héréditaire, parceque l'hérédité aurait presque toujours été retournée contre eux. Ceux qui avaient succédé à une république, avaient abaissé des nobles plus anciens et plus illustres qu'eux: ceux qui avaient succédé à d'autres seigneurs n'avaient tenu aucun compte du droit de leurs prédécesseurs, et se sentaient intéressés à le nier. Ils se disaient donc mandataires du peuple: ils ne prenaient jamais le commandement d'une ville, lors même qu'ils l'avaient soumise par les armes, sans se faire attribuer par les anciens ou par l'assemblée du peuple, selon que les uns

ou les autres se montraient plus dociles, le titre et les pouvoirs de seigneur général, pour un an, pour cinq ans, ou pour toute leur vie, avec une paie fixe, qui devoit être prise sur les deniers de la communauté.”

³ Consult especially the treatise of Xenophon, called *Hiero*, or *Τυραννικὸς*, in which the interior life and feelings of the Grecian despot are strikingly set forth, in a supposed dialogue with the poet Simonides. The tenor of Plato's remarks in the eighth and ninth books of the *Republic*, and those of Aristotle in the fifth book (ch. 8 and 9) of the *Politics*, display the same picture, though not with such fulness of detail. The speech of one of the assassins of Euphrôn (despot of Sikyon) is remarkable, as a specimen of Grecian feeling (Xenoph. *Hellen.* vii. 3, 7–12). The expressions both of Plato and Tacitus, in regard to the mental wretchedness of the despot, are the strongest which the language affords:—*Καὶ πένης τῇ ἀληθείᾳ φαίνεται, ἔάν τις ὅλην ψυχὴν ἐπίσθηται θεάσασθαι, καὶ φόβου γέμων διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου, σφαδασμῶν τε καὶ ὀδυνῶν πλήρης . . . Ἀνάγκη καὶ εἶναι, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον γίγνεσθαι αὐτῷ ἢ πρότερον διὰ τὴν ἀρχήν, φθονερῶ, ἀπίστῳ, ἀδίκῳ, ἀφίλῳ, ἀνοσίῳ, καὶ πάσης κακίας πανδοκεῖ τε καὶ τροφεῖ, καὶ ἐξ ἀπάντων τούτων μάλιστα μὲν αὐτῷ δυστυχεῖ εἶναι, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοὺς πλήσιον αὐτοῦ τοιούτους ἀπεργάζεσθαι.* (*Republic.* ix. p. 580.)

And Tacitus, in the well-known passage (*Annal.* vi. 6): “*Neque frustra*

Herodotus, Thucydides, and Isokrates, though always coveted by ambitious men, reveals clearly enough "those wounds and lacerations of mind" whereby the internal Erinnyes avenged the community upon the usurper who trampled them down. Far from considering success in usurpation as a justification of the attempt (according to the theories now prevalent respecting Cromwell and Bonaparte, who are often blamed because they kept out a legitimate king, but never because they seized an unauthorized power over the people), these philosophers regard the despot as among the greatest of criminals. The man who assassinated him was an object of public honour and reward, and a virtuous Greek would seldom have scrupled to carry his sword concealed in myrtle branches, like Harmodius and Aristogeiton, 'for the execution of the deed.' A station, which overtopped the restraints and obligations involved in citizenship, was understood at the same time to forfeit all title to the common sympathy and protection;² so that it was unsafe for the despot to visit in person those great Pan-Hellenic games in which his own chariot might perhaps have gained the prize, and in which the Theors or sacred envoys, whom

præstantissimus sapientiæ firmare solitus est, si recludantur tyrannorum mentes, posse aspicì laniatus et ictus: quando ut corpora verberibus, ita sævitiâ, libidine, malis consultis, animus dilaceretur. Quippe Tiberium non fortuna, non solitudines, protegebant, quin tormenta pectoris suasque ipse pœnas fateretur."

It is not easy to imagine power more completely surrounded with all circumstances calculated to render it repulsive to a man of ordinary benevolence: the Grecian despot had large means of doing harm,—scarcely any means of doing good. Yet the acquisition of power over others, under any conditions, is a motive so all-absorbing, that even this precarious and anti-social sceptre was always intensely coveted,—*Τυραννίς, χρήμα σφαλερόν, πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτῆς ἐρασταὶ εἰσι* (Herod. iii. 53). See the striking lines of Solon (Fragment. vii. ed. Schneidewin), and the saying of Jason of Phæræ, who used to declare that he felt hunger until he became despot,—*πεινῆν, ὅτε μὴ τυραννοῦ: ὡς οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος ιδιώτης εἶναι* (Aristot. Polit. iii. 2, 6).

¹ See the beautiful Skolion of Kallistratus, so popular at Athens, xxvii. p. 456, apud Schneidewin, Poet. Græc.—*Ἐν μύρτου κλαδί τὸ ξίφος φορήσω, &c.*

Xenophon, Hiero, ii. 8. *Οἱ τύραννοι πάντες πανταχῇ ὡς διὰ πολέμιας πορεύονται.* Compare Isokrates, Or. viii. (De Pace) p. 182; Polyb. ii. 59; Cicero, Orat. pro Milone, c. 29.

Aristot. Polit. ii. 4, 8. *Ἐπεὶ ἀδικοῦσί γε τὰ μέγιστα διὰ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὰναγκαῖα· οἷον τυραννοῦσιν, οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ῥιγῶσιν διὰ καὶ αἱ τιμαὶ μέγαλαι, ἀν' ἀποκτείνῃ τις, οὐ κλέπτην, ἀλλὰ τύραννον.*

There cannot be a more powerful manifestation of the sentiment entertained towards a despot in the ancient world, than the remarks of Plutarch on the conduct of Timoleon in assisting to put to death his brother the despot Timophanês (Plutarch, Timoleon, c. 4–7, and Comp. of Timoleon with Paulus Æmilius, c. 2). See also Plutarch, Comparison of Dion and Brutus, c. 3, and Plutarch, Præcepta Reipublicæ Gerendæ, c. 11. p. 805; c. 17, p. 813; c. 32. p. 824,—he speaks of the putting down of a despot (*τυραννίδων κατάλυσις*) as among the most splendid of human exploits—and the account given by Xenophon of the assassination of Jason of Phæræ, Hellenic. vi. 4, 32.

² Livy, xxxviii. 50. "Qui jus æquum pati non possit, in eum vim haud injustam esse." Compare Theognis, v. 1183, ed. Gaisf.

he sent as representatives of his Hellenic city, appeared with ostentatious pomp. A government carried on under these unpropitious circumstances could never be otherwise than short-lived. Though the individual daring enough to seize it, often found means to preserve it for the term of his own life, yet the sight of a despot living to old age was rare, and the transmission of his power to his son still more so.¹

Amidst the numerous points of contention in Grecian political morality, this rooted antipathy to a permanent hereditary ruler stood apart as a sentiment almost unanimous, in which the thirst for pre-eminence felt by the wealthy few, and the love of equal freedom in the bosoms of the many, alike concurred. It first began among the oligarchies of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., being a reversal of that pronounced monarchical sentiment which we now read in the Iliad; and it was transmitted by them to the democracies which did not arise until a later period. The conflict between oligarchy and despotism preceded that between oligarchy and democracy, the Lacedæmonians standing forward actively on both occasions to uphold the oligarchical principle. A mingled sentiment of fear and repugnance led them to put down despotism in several cities of Greece during the sixth century B.C., just as during their contest with Athens in the following century, they assisted the oligarchical party to overthrow democracy. And it was thus that the demagogue-despot of these earlier times—bringing out the name of the people as a pretext, and the arms of the people as a means of accomplishment, for his own ambitious designs—served

Conflict between oligarchy and despotism preceded that between oligarchy and democracy.

¹ Plutarch, Sept. Sapient. Conviv. c. 2. p. 147.—ὡς ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Μολπαγόρου τοῦ Ἰωνος, τί παραδοξότατον εἴης ἐωρακώς, ἀποκρίναιο, τύραννον γέροντα.—Compare the answer of Thales in the same treatise, c. 7. p. 152.

The orator Lysias, present at the Olympic games, and seeing the Theors of the Syracusan despot Dionysius also present in tents with gilding and purple, addressed an harangue inciting the assembled Greeks to demolish the tents (Lysiaë Λόγος Ὀλυμπιακός, Fragm. p. 911, ed. Reisk.; Dionys. Halicarn. De Lysiaë Judicium, c. 29–30). Theophrastus ascribed to Themistokles a similar recommendation in reference to the Theors and the prize chariots of the Syracusan despot Hiero (Plutarch, Themistokles, c. 25).

The common-places of the rhetors

afford the best proof how unanimous was the tendency in the Greek mind to rank the despot among the most odious criminals, and the man who put him to death among the benefactors of humanity. The rhetor Theon, treating upon common-places, says: Τόπος ἐστὶ λόγος αὐξητικὸς ὁ μολογουμένου πράγματος, ἥτοι ἀμαρτήματος, ἢ ἀνδραγαθήματος. Ἐστὶ γὰρ διττὸς ὁ τόπος· ὁ μὲν τις, κατὰ τῶν πεποιθηρευμένων, οἷον κατὰ τυράννου, προδότου, ἀνδροφόνου, ἀσώτου· ὁ δὲ τις, ὑπὲρ τῶν χρηστῶν τι διαπραγμένων· οἷον ὑπὲρ τυραννοκτόνου, ἀριστέως, νομοθέτου. (Theon, Progymnasmatà, c. vii. ap. Walz. Coll. Rhett. vol. i. p. 222. Compare Aphthonius, Progymn. c. vii. p. 82 of the same volume, and Dionysius Halikarn. Ars Rhetorica, x. 15. p. 390, ed. Reiske.)

as a preface to the reality of democracy which manifested itself at Athens a short time before the Persian war, as a development of the seed planted by Solon.

As far as our imperfect information enables us to trace, these early oligarchies of the Grecian states, against which the first usurping despots contended, contained in themselves more repulsive elements of inequality, and more mischievous barriers between the component parts of the population, than the oligarchies of later days. What was true of Hellas as an aggregate, was true, though in a less degree, of each separate community which went to compose that aggregate. Each included a variety of clans, orders, religious brotherhoods, and local or professional sections, very imperfectly cemented together: so that the oligarchy was not (like the government so denominated in subsequent times) the government of a rich few over the less rich and the poor, but that of a peculiar order, sometimes a Patrician order, over all the remaining society. In such a case the subject Many might number opulent and substantial proprietors as well as the governing Few; but these subject Many would themselves be broken into different heterogeneous fractions not heartily sympathising with each other, perhaps not intermarrying together, nor partaking of the same religious rites. The country-population, or villagers who tilled the land, seem in these early times to have been held to a painful dependence on the great proprietors who lived in the fortified town, and to have been distinguished by a dress and habits of their own, which often drew upon them an unfriendly nickname. These town proprietors often composed the governing class in early Grecian states; while their subjects consisted—1. Of the dependent cultivators living in the district around, by whom their lands were tilled. 2. Of a certain number of small self-working proprietors (*αὐτουργοί*), whose possessions were too scanty to maintain more than themselves by the labour of their own hands on their own plot of ground—residing either in the country or the town, as the case might be. 3. Of those who lived in the town, having no land, but exercising handicraft, arts or commerce.

The governing proprietors went by the name of the Gamori or Geomori, according as the Doric or Ionic dialect might be used in describing them, since they were found in states belonging to one race as well as to the other. They appear to have constituted a close order, transmitting their privileges to their children, but admitting no new members to a participation. The principle called by

Early oligarchies included a multiplicity of different sections and associations.

Government of the Geomori—a close order of present or past proprietors.

Greek thinkers a Timocracy (the apportionment of political rights and privileges according to comparative property) seems to have been little, if at all, applied in the earlier times. We know no example of it earlier than Solon. So that by the natural multiplication of families and mutation of property, there would come to be many individual Gamori possessing no land at all,¹ and perhaps worse off than those small freeholders who did not belong to the order; while some of these latter freeholders, and some of the artisans and traders in the towns, might at the same time be rising in wealth and importance. Under a political classification such as this, of which the repulsive inequality was aggravated by a rude state of manners, and which had no flexibility to meet the changes in relative position amongst individual inhabitants, discontent and outbreaks were unavoidable. The earliest despot, usually a wealthy man of the disfranchised class, became champion and leader of the malcontents.² However oppressive his rule might be, at least it was an oppression which bore with indiscriminate severity upon all the fractions of the population; and when the hour of reaction against him or against his successor arrived, so that the common enemy was expelled by the united efforts of all, it was hardly possible to revive the pre-existing system of exclusion and inequality without some considerable abatements.

As a general rule, every Greek city-community included in its population, independent of bought slaves, the three elements above noticed,—considerable land-proprietors with rustic dependents, small self-working proprietors, and town-artisans,—the three elements being found everywhere in different proportions. But the progress of events in Greece, from the seventh century B.C. downwards, tended continually to elevate the comparative importance of the two latter; while in those early days the ascendancy of the former was at its maximum, and altered only to decline. The military force of most of the cities was at first in the hands of the great proprietors, and formed by them. It consisted of cavalry, themselves and their retainers, with horses fed upon their lands. Such was the primitive oligarchical militia, as constituted in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.³ at Chalkis and Eretria in Eubœa, as well as at Kolophôn and other cities in Ionia, and as it continued in Thessaly down to the fourth century B.C. But the gradual rise of the small proprietors

Classes of the people.

Military force of the early oligarchies consisted of cavalry.

¹ Like various members of the Polish or Hungarian noblesse in recent times. | Aristot. *Rerum Public.* Fragm. ed. Neumann, Fragm. v. *Εὐβοέων πολιτείαί*, p. 112; Strabo, x. p. 447.

² Thucyd. i. 13.

³ Aristot. *Polit.* iv. 3, 2; 11, 10.

and town-artisans was marked by the substitution of heavy-armed infantry in place of cavalry. Moreover a further change not less important took place, when the resistance to Persia led to the great multiplication of Grecian ships of war, manned by a host of seamen who dwelt congregated in the maritime towns. All these movements in the Grecian communities tended to break up the close and exclusive oligarchies with which our first historical knowledge commences; and to conduct them, either to oligarchies rather more open, embracing all men of a certain amount of property—or else to democracies. But the transition in both cases was usually attained through the interlude of the despot.

In enumerating the distinct and unharmonious elements of which the population of these early Grecian communities was made up, we must not forget one further element which was to be found in the Dorian states generally—men of Dorian, as contrasted with men of non-Dorian, race. The Dorians were in all cases immigrants and conquerors, establishing themselves along with and at the expense of the prior inhabitants. Upon what terms the co-habitation was established, and in what proportions invaders and invaded came together—we have little information. Important as this circumstance is in the history of these Dorian communities, we know it only as a general fact, without being able to follow its results in detail. But we see enough to satisfy ourselves that in those revolutions which overthrew the oligarchies both at Corinth and Sikyôn—perhaps also at Megara—the Dorian and non-Dorian elements of the community came into conflict more or less direct.

The despots of Sikyôn are the earliest of whom we have any distinct mention. Their dynasty lasted 100 years, a longer period than any other Grecian despots known to Aristotle; they are said¹ moreover to have governed with mildness and with much practical respect to the pre-existing laws. Orthagoras, the beginner of the dynasty, raised himself to the position of despot about 676 B.C., subverting the pre-existing Dorian oligarchy;² but the cause and circumstances of this revolution are not

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 21. An oracle is said to have predicted to the Sikyônians that they would be subjected for the period of a century to the hand of the scourger (Diodor. Fragm. lib. vii.-x.; Fragm. xiv. ed. Maii).

² Herodot. vi. 126; Pausan. ii. 8, 1;

There is some confusion about the names of Orthagoras and Andreas; the latter is called a *cook* in Diodorus (Fragm. Excerpt. Vatic. lib. vii.-x. Fragm. xiv.). Compare Libanius in Sever. vol. iii. p. 251, Reisk. It has been supposed, with some probability, that the same

preserved. He is said to have been originally a cook. In his line of successors we find mention of Andreas, Myrôn, Aristônymus and Kleisthenês. Myrôn gained a chariot victory at Olympia in the 33rd Olympiad (648 B.C.), and built at the same holy place a thesaurus containing two ornamented alcoves of copper, for the reception of commemorative offerings from himself and his family.¹ Respecting Kleisthenês (whose age must be placed between 600-560 B.C., but can hardly be determined accurately), some facts are reported to us highly curious, but of a nature not altogether easy to follow or verify.

We learn from the narrative of Herodotus that the tribe to which Kleisthenês² himself (and of course his progenitors Orthagoras and the other Orthagoridæ also) belonged, Violent proceedings of Kleisthenês. was distinct from the three Dorian tribes, who have been already named in my previous chapter respecting the Lyncurgen constitution at Sparta—the Hylleis, Pamphyli, and Dymanes. We also learn that these tribes were common to the Sikyonians and the Argeians. Kleisthenês, being in a state of bitter hostility with Argos, tried in several ways to abolish the points of community between the two. Sikyôn, originally dorised by settlers from Argos, was included in the “lot of Temênus,” or among the towns of the Argeian confederacy. The coherence of this confederacy had become weaker and weaker, partly without doubt through the influence of the predecessors of Kleisthenês; but the Argeians may perhaps have tried to revive it, thus placing themselves in a state of war with the latter, and inducing him to disconnect palpably and violently Sikyôn from Argos. There were two anchors by

person is designated under both names: the two names do not seem to occur in the same author. See Plutarch, Ser. Numin. Vind. c. 7. p. 553.

Aristotle (Polit. v. 10, 3) seems to have conceived the dominion as having passed direct from Myrôn to Kleisthenês, omitting Aristônymus.

¹ Pausan. vi. 19; 2. The Eleians informed Pausanias that the brass in these alcoves came from Tartessus (the southwestern coast of Spain from the Strait of Gibraltar to the territory beyond Cadiz): he declines to guarantee the statement. But O. Müller treats it as a certainty, —“two apartments inlaid with Tartessian brass, and adorned with Doric and Ionic columns. Both the architectural orders employed in this building, and the Tartessian brass, which the Phocæans had then brought

to Greece in large quantities from the hospitable king Arganthonius, attest the intercourse of Myrôn with the Asiatics.” (Dorians, i. 8, 2.) So also Dr. Thirlwall states the fact: “copper of Tartessus, which had not long been introduced into Greece.” (Hist. Gr. ch. x. p. 483, 2nd ed.) Yet, if we examine the chronology of the case, we shall see that the thirty-third Olympiad (648 B.C.) must have been earlier even than the first discovery of Tartessus by the Greeks,—before the accidental voyage of the Samian merchant Kôlaeus first made the region known to them, and more than half a century (at least) earlier than the commerce of the Phocæans with Arganthonius. Compare Herod. iv. 152; i. 163, 167.

² Herodot. v. 67.

which the connexion held—first, legendary and religious sympathy ; next, the civil rites and denominations current among the Sikyonian Dorians : both of them were torn up by Kleisthenês. He changed the names both of the three Dorian tribes, and of that non-Dorian tribe to which he himself belonged : the last he called by the complimentary title of Archelai (commanders of the people) ; the first three he styled by the insulting names of Hyatæ, Oneatæ, and Chœreatæ, from the three Greek words signifying a boar, an ass, and a little pig. The extreme bitterness of such an insult can only be appreciated when we fancy to ourselves the reverence with which the tribes in a Grecian city regarded the hero from whom their name was borrowed. That these new denominations, given by Kleisthenês, involved an intentional degradation of the Dorian tribes as well as an assumption of superiority for his own, is affirmed by Herodotus, and seems well-deserving of credit.

But the violence of which Kleisthenês was capable in his anti-Argeian antipathy, is manifested still more plainly in his proceedings with respect to the hero Adrastus and to the legendary sentiment of the people. Something has already been said in a former chapter¹ about this remarkable incident, which must however be here again briefly noticed. The hero Adrastus, whose chapel Herodotus himself saw in the Sikyonian agora, was common both to Argos and to Sikyôn, and was the object of special reverence at both. He figures in the legend as king of Argos, and as the grandson and heir of Polybus king of Sikyôn. He was the unhappy leader of the two sieges of Thebes, so famous in the ancient epic. The Sikyonians listened with delight both to the exploits of the Argeians against Thebes, as celebrated in the recitations of the epical rhapsodes, and to the mournful tale of Adrastus and his family misfortunes, as sung in the tragic chorus. Kleisthenês not only forbade the rhapsodes to come to Sikyôn, but further resolved to expel Adrastus himself from the country—such is the literal Greek expression,² the hero himself being believed to be actually present and domiciled among the people. He first applied to the Delphian oracle for permission to carry this banishment into direct effect ; but the Pythian priestess returned an answer of indignant refusal,—“ Adrastus is king of the Sikyonians, but thou art a ruffian.” Thus baffled, he put in practice a stratagem calculated

¹ See above, Part I. ch. 21.

² Herod. v. 67. Τοῦτον ἐπεθύμησε δὲ | Κλεισθένης, ὄντα Ἀργεῖον, ἐκβαλεῖν ἐκ
τῆς χώρας.

to induce Adrastus to depart of his own accord.¹ He sent to Thebes to beg that he might be allowed to introduce into Sikyôn the hero Melanippus; and the permission was granted. Now Melanippus—being celebrated in the legend as the puissant champion of Thebes against Adrastus and the Argeian besiegers, and as having slain both Mêkisteus the brother, and Tydeus the son-in-law, of Adrastus—was pre-eminently odious to the latter. Kleisthenês brought this anti-national hero into Sikyôn, assigning to him consecrated ground in the prytaneium or government-house, and even in that part which was most strongly fortified:² (for it seems that Adrastus was conceived as likely to assail and do battle with the intruder)—moreover he took away both the tragic choruses and the sacrifice from Adrastus, assigning the former to the god Dionysus, and the latter to Melanippus.

The religious manifestations of Sikyôn being thus transferred from Adrastus to his mortal foe, and from the cause of the Argeians in the siege of Thebes to that of the Thebans, Adrastus was presumed to have voluntarily retired from the place. And the purpose which Kleisthenês contemplated, of breaking the community of feeling between Sikyôn and Argos, was in part accomplished.

A ruler who could do such violence to the religious and legendary sentiment of his community may well be supposed capable of inflicting that deliberate insult upon the Dorian tribes which is implied in their new appellations. As we are uninformed, however, of the state of things which preceded, we know not how far it may have been a retaliation for previous insult in the opposite direction. It is plain that the Dorians of Sikyôn maintained themselves and their ancient tribes quite apart from the remaining community; though what the other constituent portions of the population were, or in what relation they stood to these Dorians, we are not enabled to make out. We hear indeed of a dependent rural population in the territory of Sikyôn, as well as in that of Argos and Epidaurus, analogous to the *Helots* in Laconia. In Sikyôn this class was termed the *Korynêphori* (club-men) or the *Katônakophori*, from the thick woollen mantle which they wore, with a sheepskin sewn on to the skirt: in Argos they were called *Gymnêsi*, from their not possessing the military panoply or the use of regular arms: in Epidaurus, *Konipodes* or the *Dusty-footed*.³

¹ Herod. v. 67. Ἐφρόντιζε μηχανὴν τῇ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀδρηστος ἀπαλλάσσεται

² Ἐπαγαγόμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν Μελάνιππον, τέμενος οἱ ἀπέδεξε ἐν αὐτῷ

τῷ πρυτανεῖῳ, καὶ μιν ἐνθαῦτα ἵδρυσεν ἐν τῷ ἰσχυροτάτῳ. (Herod. *ib.*)

³ Julius Pollux, iii. 83; Plutarch, *Quæst. Græc.* c. l. p. 291; Theopompus

We may conclude that a similar class existed in Corinth, in Megara, and in each of the Dorian towns of the Argolic Aktê. But besides the Dorian tribes and these rustics, there must probably have existed non-Dorian proprietors and town residents, and upon them we may suppose that the power of the Orthagoridæ and of Kleisthenês was founded, perhaps more friendly and indulgent to the rustic serfs than that of the Dorians had been previously. The moderation, which Aristotle ascribes to the Orthagoridæ generally, is belied by the proceedings of Kleisthenês. But we may probably believe that his predecessors, content with maintaining the real predominance of the non-Dorian over the Dorian population, meddled very little with the separate position and civil habits of the latter—while Kleisthenês, provoked or alarmed by some attempt on their part to strengthen alliance with the Argeians, resorted both to repressive measures and to that offensive nomenclature which has been above cited. The preservation of the power of Kleisthenês was due to his military energy (according to Aristotle) even more than to his moderation and popular conduct. It was aided probably by his magnificent displays at the public games, for he was victor in the chariot-race at the Pythian games 582 B.C., as well as at the Olympic games besides. Moreover he was in fact the last of the race, nor did he transmit his power to any successor.¹

The reigns of the early Orthagoridæ then may be considered as marking a predominance, newly acquired but quietly exercised, of the non-Dorians over the Dorians in Sikyôn: the reign of Kleisthenês, as displaying a strong explosion of antipathy from the former towards the latter. And though this antipathy, with the application of those opprobrious tribe-names in which it was conveyed, stand ascribed to Kleisthenês personally—we may see that the non-Dorians in Sikyôn shared it generally, because these same tribe-names continued to be applied not only during the reign of that despot, but also for sixty years longer; after his death. It is hardly necessary to remark that such denominations could never have been acknowledged or employed among the Dorians themselves. After the lapse of sixty years from the death of Kleisthenês, the Sikyonians came to an amicable adjust-

ap. Athenæum, vi. p. 271; Welcker, Prolegomen. ad Theognid. c. 19. p. xxxiv.

As an analogy to this name of Konipodes, we may notice the ancient courts

of justice called Courts of *Pie-powder* in England, *Pieds-poudrés*.

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 9; 21; Pausan. x. 7, 3.

ment of the feud, and placed the tribe-names on a footing satisfactory to all parties. The old Dorian denominations (Hylleis, Pamphyli, and Dymanes) were re-established, while the name of the fourth tribe, or non-Dorians, was changed from Archelai to Ægialeis—Ægialeus son of Adrastus being constituted their eponymus.¹ This choice, of the son of Adrastus for an eponymus, seems to show that the worship of Adrastus himself was then revived in Sikyôn, since it existed in the time of Herodotus.

Of the war which Kleisthenês helped to conduct against Kirrha, for the protection of the Delphian temple, I shall speak in another place. His death and the cessation of his dynasty seem to have occurred about 560 B.C., as far as the chronology can be made out.² That he was put down by the Spartans (as K. F. Hermann, O. Müller, and Dr. Thirlwall suppose)³ can be hardly admitted consistently with the narrative of

The Sikyonian despots not put down by Sparta.

¹ Herod. v. 68. *Τούτοις τοῖς οὐνόμασι τῶν φυλῶν ἐχρέωντο οἱ Σικυνῶνιοι, καὶ ἐπὶ Κλεισθένους ἀρχόντος, καὶ ἐκείνου τεθνεώτος ἔτι ἐπ' ἕτερα ἐξήκοντα μετέπειτα μέντοι λόγον σφίσι δόντες, μετέβαλον ἐς τοὺς Ὑλλεῖας καὶ Παμφύλους καὶ Δυμανάτας· τετάρτους δὲ αὐτοῖσι προσέθεντο ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀδράστου παιδὸς Αἰγιαλέος τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ποιούμενοι κεκλήσθαι Αἰγιαλέας.*

² The chronology of Orthagoras and his dynasty is perplexing. The commemorative offering of Myron at Olympia is marked for 648 B.C., and this must throw back the beginning of Orthagoras to a period between 689–670. Then we are told by Aristotle that the entire dynasty lasted 100 years; but it must have lasted probably somewhat longer, for the death of Kleisthenês can hardly be placed earlier than 560 B.C. The war against Kirrha (595 B.C.) and the Pythian victory (582 B.C.) fall within his reign; but the marriage of his daughter Agaristê with Megaklês can hardly be put earlier than 570 B.C., if so high; for Kleisthenês the Athenian, the son of that marriage, effected the democratical revolution at Athens in 509 or 508 B.C. Whether the daughter whom Megaklês gave in marriage to Peisistratus about 554 B.C., was also the offspring of that marriage, as Larcher contends, we do not know.

Megaklês was the son of that Alkmæon who had assisted the deputies sent by Cræsus of Lydia into Greece to consult the different oracles, and whom Cræsus rewarded so liberally as to make

his fortune (compare Herod. i. 46; vi. 125): and the marriage of Megaklês was in the next generation after this enrichment of Alkmæon—*μετὰ δὲ, γενεῇ δευτέρῃ ὕστερον* (Herod. vi. 126). Now the reign of Cræsus extended from 560–546 B.C., and his deputation to the oracles in Greece appears to have taken place about 556 B.C. If this chronology be admitted, the marriage of Megaklês with the daughter of the Sikyonian Kleisthenês cannot have taken place until considerably after 556 B.C. See the long, but not very satisfactory, note of Larcher, ad Herodot. v. 66.

But I shall show grounds for believing, when I recount the interview between Solon and Cræsus, that Herodotus in his conception of events misdates very considerably the reign and proceedings of Cræsus as well as of Peisistratus. This is a conjecture of Niebuhr which I think very just, and which is rendered still more probable by what we find here stated about the succession of the Alkmæonidae. For it is evident that Herodotus here conceives the adventure between Alkmæon and Cræsus as having occurred one generation (about twenty-five or thirty years) anterior to the marriage between Megaklês and the daughter of Kleisthenês. That adventure will thus stand about 590–585 B.C., which would be about the time of the supposed interview (if real) between Solon and Cræsus, describing the maximum of the power and prosperity of the latter.

³ Müller, Dorians, book i. 8, 2; Thirl-

Herodotus, who mentions the continuance of the insulting names imposed by him upon the Dorian tribes for many years after his death. Now, had the Spartans forcibly interfered for the suppression of his dynasty, we may reasonably presume that, even if they did not restore the decided preponderance of the Dorians in Sikyôn, they would at least have rescued the Dorian tribes from this obvious ignominy. But it seems doubtful whether Kleisthênes had any son: and the extraordinary importance attached to the marriage of his daughter Agaristê, whom he bestowed upon the Athenian Megaklês of the great family Alkmæônidæ, seems rather to evince that she was an heiress—not to his power, but to his wealth. There can be no doubt as to the fact of that marriage, from which was born the Athenian leader Kleisthenês, afterwards the author of the great democratical revolution at Athens after the expulsion of the Peisistratidæ; but the lively and amusing details with which Herodotus has surrounded it bear much more the stamp of romance than of reality. Drest up apparently by some ingenious Athenian as a compliment to the Alkmæonid lineage of his city, which comprised both Kleisthenês and Periklês, the narrative commemorates a marriage-rivalry between that lineage and another noble Athenian house, and at the same time gives a mythical explanation of a phrase seemingly proverbial at Athens—“*Hippokleides don't care.*”¹

wall, Hist. of Greece, vol. i. ch. x. p. 486, 2nd ed.

¹ Herod. vi. 127–131. The locution explained is—Οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ: compare the allusions to it in the Parcmiographi, Zenob. v. 31; Diogenian. vii. 21; Suidas, xi. 45, ed. Schott.

The convocation of the suitors at the invitation of Kleisthenes from all parts of Greece, and the distinctive mark and character of each, is prettily told, as well as the drunken freak whereby Hippokleidês forfeits both the favour of Kleisthenês and the hand of Agaristê which he was on the point of obtaining. It seems to be a story framed upon the model of various incidents in the old epic, especially the suitors of Hellen.

On one point, however, the author of the story seems to have overlooked both the exigencies of chronology and the historical position and feelings of his hero Kleisthenês. For among the suitors who present themselves at Sikyôn in conformity with the invitation of the latter, one is Leôkêdês, son of Pheidôn the despot of Argos. Now the hostility

and vehement antipathy towards Argos, which Herodotus ascribes in another place to the Sikyonian Kleisthenês, renders it all but impossible that the son of any king of Argos could have become a candidate for the hand of Agaristê. I have already recounted the violence which Kleisthenês did to the legendary sentiment of his native town, and the insulting names which he put upon the Sikyonian Dorians—all under the influence of a strong anti-Argeian feeling. Next, as to chronology: Pheidôn king of Argos lived some time between 760–730; and his son can never have been a candidate for the daughter of Kleisthenês, whose reign falls 600–560 B.C. Chronologers resort here to the usual resource in cases of difficulty: they recognise a second and later Pheidôn, whom they affirm that Herodotus has confounded with the first; or they alter the text of Herodotus by reading in place of “son of Pheidôn,” “descendant of Pheidôn.” But neither of these conjectures rests upon any basis: the text of Herodotus is smooth and clear, and

Plutarch numbers Æschinês of Sikyôn¹ among the despots put down by Sparta: at what period this took place, or how it is to be connected with the history of Kleisthenês as given in Herodotus, we are unable to say.

Contemporaneous with the Orthagoridæ at Sikyôn—but beginning a little later and closing somewhat earlier—we find the despots Kypselus and Periander at Corinth. The former appears as the subverter of the oligarchy called the Bacchiadæ. Of the manner in which he accomplished his object we find no information: and this historical blank is inadequately filled up by various religious prognostics and oracles, foreshadowing the rise, the harsh rule, and the dethronement after two generations, of these powerful despots.

According to an idea deeply seated in the Greek mind, the destruction of a great prince or of a great power is usually signified by the gods beforehand, though either through hardness of heart or inadvertence no heed is taken of the warning. In reference to Kypselus and the Bacchiadæ, we are informed that Melas, the ancestor of the former, was one of the original settlers at Corinth who accompanied the first Dorian chief Alêtês, and that Alêtês was in vain warned by an oracle not to admit him.² Again too, immediately before Kypselus was born, the Bacchiadæ received notice that his mother was about to give birth to one who would prove their ruin: the dangerous infant escaped destruction only by a hair's breadth, being preserved from the intent of his destroyers by lucky concealment in a chest. Labda, the mother of Kypselus, was daughter of Amphion, who belonged to the gens or sept of the Bacchiadæ; but she was lame, and none of the gens would consent to marry her with that deformity. Eetiôn, son of Echekratês, who became her husband, belonged to a different, yet hardly less distinguished, heroic genealogy. He was of the Lapithæ, descended from Kæneus, and dwelling in the Corinthian deme called Petra. We see thus that Kypselus was not only a high-born man in the city, but a Bacchiad by half-birth: both of these circumstances were likely to make exclusion from the government intolerable to him. He rendered himself highly popular with the people, and by their aid overthrew and expelled the Bacchiadæ, continuing as despot at Corinth for thirty years until his death (B.C. 655–625). According

the second Pheidôn is nowhere else authenticated. See Larcher and Wesseling *ad loc.*: compare also Part II. ch. 4. of this History.

¹ Plutarch, *De Herod. Malign.* c. 21. p. 859.

² Pausan. ii. 4, 9.

to Aristotle, he maintained throughout life the same conciliatory behaviour by which his power had first been acquired ; and his popularity was so effectually sustained that he had never any occasion for a body-guard. But the Corinthian oligarchy of the century of Herodotus (whose tale that historian has embodied in the oration of the Corinthian envoy *Sosiklês*¹ to the Spartans) gave a very different description, and depicted Kypselus as a cruel ruler, who banished, robbed, and murdered by wholesale.

His son and successor Periander, though energetic as a warrior, distinguished as an encourager of poetry and music, and even numbered by some among the seven wise men of Greece—is nevertheless uniformly represented as oppressive and inhuman in his treatment of subjects. The revolting stories which are told respecting his private life, and his relations with his mother and his wife, may for the most part be regarded as calumnies suggested by odious associations with his memory. But there seems good reason for imputing to him tyranny of the worst character. The sanguinary maxims of precaution, so often acted upon by Grecian despots, were traced back in ordinary belief to Periander² and his contemporary Thrasybulus despot of Milêtus. He maintained a powerful body-guard, shed much blood, and was exorbitant in his exactions, a part of which was employed in votive offerings at Olympia. Such munificence to the gods was considered by Aristotle and others as part of a deliberate system, with the view of keeping his subjects both hard at work and poor. On one occasion we are told that he invited the women of Corinth to assemble for the celebration of a religious festival, and then stripped them of their rich attire and ornaments. By some later writers he is painted at the stern foe of everything like luxury and dissolute habits—enforcing industry, compelling every man to render account of his means of livelihood, and causing the procuresses of Corinth to be thrown into the sea.³ Though the general features of his character, his cruel tyranny no less than his vigour and ability, may be sufficiently relied on, yet the particular incidents connected with his name are all extremely dubious. The most credible of all

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 22; Herodot. v. 92. The tale respecting Kypselus and his wholesale exaction from the people, contained in the spurious second book of the *Œconomica* of Aristotle, coincides with the general view of Herodotus (Aristot. *Œconom.* ii. 2); but I do not trust the statements of this treatise for facts of the sixth or seventh cen-

turies B.C.

² Aristot. Polit. v. 9, 2–22: iii. 8, 3. Herodot. v. 92.

³ Ephorus, Frag. 106, ed. Marx.; Herakleidês Ponticus, Frag. v. ed. Köhler; Nicolaus Damasc. p. 50, ed. Orell.; Diogen. Laërt. i. 96–98; Suidas, v. *Κυψελίδων ἀνδρόθηα*.

seems to be the tale of his inexorable quarrel with his son and his brutal treatment of many noble Korkyræan youths, as related in Herodotus. Periander is said to have put to death his wife Melissa, daughter of Proklês despot of Epidaurus. His son Lykophrôn, informed of this deed, contracted an incurable antipathy against him. Periander, after vainly trying both by rigour and by conciliation, to conquer this feeling on the part of his son, sent him to reside at Korkyra, then dependent upon his rule; but when he found himself growing old and disabled, he recalled him to Corinth, in order to ensure the continuance of the dynasty. Lykophrôn still obstinately declined all personal communication with his father, upon which the latter desired him to come to Corinth, and engaged himself to go over to Korkyra. So terrified were the Korkyræans at the idea of a visit from this formidable old man, that they put Lykophrôn to death—a deed which Periander avenged by seizing three hundred youths of their noblest families, and sending them over to the Lydian king Alyattês at Sardis, in order that they might be castrated and made to serve as eunuchs. The Corinthian vessels in which the youths were despatched fortunately touched at Samos in the way; where the Samians and Knidians, shocked at a proceeding which outraged all Hellenic sentiment, contrived to rescue the youths from the miserable fate intended for them, and after the death of Periander sent them back to their native island.¹

While we turn with displeasure from the political life of this man, we are at the same time made acquainted with the great extent of his power—greater than that which was ever possessed by Corinth after the extinction of his dynasty. Korkyra, Ambrakia, Leukas, and Anaktorium, all Corinthian colonies, but in the next century independent states, appear in his time dependencies of Corinth. Ambrakia is said to have been under the rule of another despot named Periander, probably also a Kypselid by birth. It seems indeed that the towns of Anaktorium, Leukas, and Apollonia in the Ionian Gulf, were either founded by the Kypselids, or received reinforcements of Corinthian colonists, during their dynasty, though Korkyra was established considerably earlier.²

The reign of Periander lasted for forty years (B.C. 625-585):

¹ Herodot. iii. 47-54. He details at some length this tragical story. Compare Plutarch, *De Herodoti Malignitat.* c. 22. p. 860.

² Aristot. *Polit.* v. 3, 6; 8, 9. Plutarch, *Amatorius*, c. 23. p. 768. and *De*

Serâ Numinis Vindictâ, c. 7. p. 553. Strabo, vii. p. 325; x. p. 452. Seymrus Chius, v. 454, and Antoninus Liberalis, c. iv., who quotes the lost work called *Ἀμβρακικά* of Athanadas.

Great power
of Corinth
under Peri-
ander.

Psammetichus son of Gordius, who succeeded him, reigned three years, and the Kypselid dynasty is then said to have closed, after having continued for seventy-three years.¹ In respect of power, magnificent display, and wide-spread connexions both in Asia and in Italy, they evidently stood high among the Greeks of their time. Their offerings consecrated at Olympia excited great admiration, especially the gilt colossal statue of Zeus and the large chest of cedar-wood dedicated in the temple of Hêrê, overlaid with various figures in gold and ivory. The figures were borrowed from mythical and legendary story, while the chest was a commemoration both of the name of Kypselus and of the tale of his marvellous preservation in infancy.² If Plutarch is correct, this powerful dynasty is to be numbered among the despots put down by Sparta.³ Yet such intervention of the Spartans, granting it to have been matter of fact, can hardly have been known to Herodotus.

Coincident in point of time with the commencement of Periander's reign at Corinth, we find Theagenês despot at Megara—
 Megara—
 Theagenês
 the despot. Megara, who is also said to have acquired his power by demagogic arts, as well as by violent aggressions against the rich proprietors, whose cattle he destroyed in their pastures by the side of the river. We are not told by what previous conduct on the part of the rich this hatred of the people had been earned; but Theagenês carried the popular feeling completely along with him, obtained by public vote a body of guards ostensibly for his personal safety, and employed them to overthrow the oligarchy.⁴ Yet he did not maintain his power even for his own life. A second

¹ See Mr. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, ad ann. 625–585 B.C.

² Pausan. v. 2, 4; 17, 2. Strabo, viii. p. 353. Compare Schneider, *Epimetheus* ad Xenophon. *Anab.* p. 570. The chest was seen at Olympia both by Pausanias and by Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* xi. p. 325, Reiske).

³ Plutarch, *De Herodot.* *Malign.* c. 21. p. 859. If Herodotus had known or believed that the dynasty of the Kypselids at Corinth was put down by Sparta, he could not have failed to make allusion to the fact in the long harangue which he ascribes to the Corinthian *Sosiklês* (v. 92). Whoever reads that speech, will perceive that the inference from silence to ignorance is in this case almost irresistible.

O. Müller ascribes to Periander a policy intentionally anti-Dorian —

“prompted by the wish of utterly eradicating the peculiarities of the Doric race. For this reason he abolished the public tables, and prohibited the ancient education.” (*O. Müller, Dorians*, iii. 8, 3.)

But it cannot be shown that any *public tables* (*συσσίτια*) or any peculiar education, analogous to those of Sparta, ever existed at Corinth. If nothing more be meant by these *συσσίτια* than public banquets on particular festive occasions (see Welcker, *Prolegom.* ad Theognid. c. 20. p. xxxvii.), these are noway peculiar to Dorian cities. Nor does Theognis, v. 270, bear out Welcker in affirming “*syssitiorum vetus institutum*” at Megara.

⁴ Aristot. *Polit.* v. 4, 5; *Rhetor.* i. 2, 7.

revolution dethroned and expelled him, on which occasion, after a short interval of temperate government, the people are said to have renewed in a still more marked way their antipathies against the rich; banishing some of them with confiscation of property, intruding into the houses of others with demands for forced hospitality, and even passing a formal *Palintokia*—or decree to require, from the rich who had lent money on interest, the refunding of all past interest paid to them by their debtors.¹ To appreciate correctly such a demand, we must recollect that the practice of taking interest for money lent was regarded by a large proportion of early ancient society with feelings of unqualified reprobation. And it will be seen, when we come to the legislation of Solon, how much such violent reactionary feeling against the creditor was provoked by the antecedent working of the harsh law determining his rights.

We hear in general terms of more than one revolution in the government of Megara—a disorderly democracy subverted by returning oligarchical exiles, and these again unable long to maintain themselves;² but we are alike uninformed as to dates and details. And in respect to one of these struggles we are admitted to the outpourings of a contemporary and a sufferer—the Megarian poet Theognis. Unfortunately his elegiac verses as we possess them are in a state so broken, incoherent and interpolated, that we make out no distinct conception of the events which call them forth. Still less can we discover in the verses of Theognis that strength and peculiarity of pure Dorian feeling, which, since the publication of O. Müller's *History of the Dorians*, it has been the fashion to look for so extensively. But we see that the poet was connected with an oligarchy of birth, and not of wealth, which had recently been subverted by the breaking in of the rustic population previously subject and degraded—that these subjects were content to submit to a single-headed despot, in order to escape from their former rulers—and that Theognis had himself been betrayed by his own friends and companions, stripped of his property and exiled, through the wrong doing “of enemies whose blood he hopes one day to be permitted to drink.”³ The condition of the subject cultivators previous to this revolution he depicts in sad colours: they “dwelt without the city, clad in goat-

¹ Plutarch, *Quæst. Græc. c.* 18. p. 295.

² Aristot. *Polit.* iv. 12, 10; v. 2, 6; 4, 3.

³ Theognis, vv. 262, 349, 512, 600, 828, 834, 1119, 1200, Gaisf. edit. :—

Τῶν εἴη μέλαν αἶμα πιεῖν, &c.

skins, and ignorant of judicial sanctions or laws:"¹ after it, they had become citizens, and their importance had been immensely enhanced. Thus (according to his impression) the vile breed has trodden down the noble—the bad have become masters, and the good are no longer of any account. The bitterness and humiliation which attend upon poverty, and the undue ascendancy which wealth confers even upon the most worthless of mankind,² are among the prominent subjects of his complaint. His keen personal feeling on this point would be alone sufficient to show that the recent revolution had no way overthrown the influence of property; in contradiction to the opinion of Welcker, who infers without ground, from a passage of uncertain meaning, that the land of the state had been formally re-divided.³ The Megarian revolution, so far

¹ Theognis, v. 349, Gaisf. :—

Κίρνε, πόλις μὲν ἔθ' ἥδε πόλις, λαοὶ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι,

Οἱ πρόσθ' οὔτε δίκας ἤδεσαν οὔτε νόμους,
Ἄλλα' ἀμφὶ πλευρῇσι δορὰς αἰγῶν κατέτριβον,
Ἐξω δ' ὥστ' ἔλαφοι τῆσδ' ἐνέμοντο πόλεος.

² Theognis, vv. 174, 267, 523, 700, 865, Gaisf.

³ Consult the Prolegomena to Welcker's edition of Theognis; also those of Schneidewin (Delectus Elegiac. Poetar. p. 46–55).

The Prolegomena of Welcker are particularly valuable and full of instruction. He illustrates at great length the tendency common to Theognis with other early Greek poets, to apply the words *good* and *bad*, not with reference to any ethical standard, but to wealth as contrasted with poverty—nobility with low birth—strength with weakness—conservative and oligarchical politics as opposed to innovation (sect. 10–18). The ethical meaning of these words is not absolutely unknown, yet rare, in Theognis: it gradually grew up at Athens, and became popularized by the Socratic school of philosophers as well as by the orators. But the early or political meaning always remained, and the fluctuation between the two has been productive of frequent misunderstanding. Constant attention is necessary when we read the expressions of ἀγαθοί, ἐσθλοί, βέλτιστοι, καλοκάγαθοι, χρηστοί, &c., or on the other hand, οἱ κακοί, δειλοί, &c., to examine whether the context is such as to give to them the ethical or the political meaning. Welcker seems to go a step too far when he says that the latter sense “fell into

desuetude, through the influence of the Socratic philosophy.” (Proleg. sect. 11. p. xxv.) The two meanings both remained extant at the same time, as we see by Aristotle (Polit. iv. 8, 2)—σχεδὸν γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις οἱ εὐποροί, τῶν καλῶν κάγαθων δοκοῦσι κατέχειν χάραν. A careful distinction is sometimes found in Plato and Thucydides, who talk of the oligarchs as “the persons called super-excellent”—τοὺς καλοὺς κάγαθοὺς ὀνομαζομένους (Thucyd. viii. 48)—ὑπὸ τῶν πλουσίων τε καὶ καλῶν κάγαθων λεγομένων ἐν τῇ πόλει (Plato, Rep. viii. p. 569).

The same double sense is to be found equally prevalent in the Latin language: “*Bonique et mali cives appellati, non ob merita in rempublicam, omnibus pariter corruptis: sed uti quisque locupletissimus, et injuriâ validior, quia præsentia defendebat, pro bono habebatur.*” (Salust. Hist. Fragment. lib. i. p. 935, Cort.) And again Cicero (De Republ. i. 34): “Hoc errore vulgi cum rempublicam opes paucorum, non virtutes, tenere cœperunt, nomen illi principes *optimatum* mordicus tenent, re autem carent eo nomine.” In Cicero's Oration pro Sextio (c. 45) the two meanings are intentionally confounded together, when he gives his definition of *optimus quisque*. Welcker (Proleg. s. 12) produces several other examples of the like equivocal meaning. There are not wanting instances of the same use of language in the laws and customs of the early Germans—boni homines, probi homines, Rachinburgi, Gudemänner. See Savigny, Geschichte des Römisch. Rechts im Mittelalter, vol. i. p. 184; vol. ii. p. xxii.

as we apprehend it from Theognis, appears to have improved materially the condition of the cultivators around the town, and to have strengthened a certain class whom he considers "the bad rich"—while it extinguished the privileges of that governing order, to which he himself belonged, denominated in his language "the good and the virtuous," with ruinous effect upon his own individual fortunes. How far this governing order was exclusively Dorian, we have no means of determining. The political change by which Theognis suffered, and the new despot whom he indicates as either actually installed or nearly impending, must have come considerably after the despotism of Theagenês; for the life of the poet seems to fall between 570-490 B.C., while Theagenês must have ruled about 630-600 B.C. From the unfavourable picture therefore, which the poet gives as his own early experience, of the condition of the rural cultivators, it is evident that the despot Theagenês had neither conferred upon them any permanent benefit, nor given them access to the judicial protection of the city.

It is thus that the despots of Corinth, Sikyôn and Megara serve as samples of those revolutionary influences which towards the beginning of the sixth century B.C. seem to have shaken or overturned the oligarchical governments in very many cities throughout the Grecian world. There existed a certain sympathy and alliance between the despots of Corinth and Sikyôn:¹ how far such feeling was further extended to Megara we do not know. The latter city seems evidently to have been more populous and powerful during the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. than we shall afterwards find her throughout the two brilliant centuries of Grecian history. Her colonies, found as far distant as Bithynia and the Thracian Bosphorus on one side, and as Sicily on the other, argue an extent of trade as well as naval force once not inferior to Athens; so that we shall be the less surprised when we approach the life of Solon, to find her in possession of the island of Salamis, and long maintaining it, at one time with every promise of triumph, against the entire force of the Athenians.

Analogy of
Corinth,
Sikyôn and
Megara.

¹ Herod. vi. 128.

CHAPTER X.

IONIC PORTION OF HELLAS.—ATHENS BEFORE SOLON.

HAVING traced in the preceding chapters the scanty stream of Peloponnesian history, from the first commencement of an authentic chronology in 776 B.C., to the maximum of Spartan territorial acquisition, and the general acknowledgement of Spartan primacy, prior to 547 B.C., I proceed to state as much as can be made out respecting the Ionic portion of Hellas during the same period. This portion comprehends Athens and Eubœa—the Cyclades islands—and the Ionic cities on the coast of Asia Minor, with their different colonies.

In the case of Peloponnesus, we have been enabled to discern something like an order of real facts in the period alluded to—Sparta makes great strides, while Argos falls. In the case of Athens, unfortunately, our materials are less instructive. The number of historical facts, anterior to the Solonian legislation, is very few indeed: the interval between 776 B.C. and 624 B.C., the epoch of Draco's legislation a short time prior to Kylon's attempted usurpation, gives us merely a list of archons, denuded of all incident.

In compliment to the heroism of Kodrus, who had sacrificed his life for the safety of his country, we are told that no person after him was permitted to bear the title of king.¹ His son Medôn, and twelve successors—Akastus, Archipus, Thersippus, Phorbas, Megaklês, Diognêtus, Phereklês, Aripchrôn, Thespheus, Agamestôr, Æschylus, and Alkmæôn—were all archons for life. In the second year of Alkmæôn (752 B.C.), the dignity of archon was restricted to a duration of ten years: and seven of these decennial archons are numbered—Charops, Æsimidês, Kleidikus, Hippomenês, Leokratês, Apsandrus, Eryxias. With Kreôn, who succeeded Eryxias, the archonship was not only made annual, but put into commission and distributed among nine persons. These nine archons annually changed continue throughout all the historical period, interrupted

History of Athens before Draco—only a list of names.
No king after Kodrus. Life archons. Decennial archons. Annual archons, nine in number.

¹ Justin. ii. 7.

only by the few intervals of political disturbance and foreign compression. Down to Kleidikus and Hippomenês (714 B.C.), the dignity of archon had continued to belong exclusively to the Medontidæ or descendants of Medôn and Kodrus;¹ at that period it was thrown open to all the Eupatrids, or order of nobility in the state.

Such is the series of names by which we step down from the level of legend to that of history. All our historical knowledge of Athens is confined to the period of the annual archons; which series of eponymous archons, from Kreôn downwards, is perfectly trustworthy.² Above 683 B.C., the Attic antiquaries have provided us with a string of names, which we must take as we find them, without being able either to warrant the whole or to separate the false from the true. There is no reason to doubt the general fact that Athens, like so many other communities of Greece, was in its primitive times governed by an hereditary line of kings, and that it passed from that form of government into a commonwealth, first oligarchical, afterwards democratical.

Archonship
of Kreôn,
B.C. 683—
commence-
ment of
Attic chro-
nology.

We are in no condition to determine the civil classification and political constitution of Attica, even at the period of the archonship of Kreôn, 683 B.C., when authentic Athenian chronology first commences—much less can we pretend to any knowledge of the anterior centuries. Great political changes were introduced first by Solon (about 594 B.C.), next by Kleisthenês (509 B.C.), afterwards by Aristeidês, Periklês and Ephialtês, between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars: so that the old ante-Solonian—nay even the real Solonian—polity was thus put more and more out of date and out of knowledge. But all the information which we possess respecting that old polity is derived from authors who lived after all or most of these great changes—and who, finding no records, nor anything better than current legends, explained the foretime as well as they could by guesses more or less ingenious, generally attached to the dominant legendary names. They were sometimes able to found their conclusions upon religious usages, periodical ceremonies, or common sacrifices, still subsisting in their own time. These were doubtless

Obscurity of
the civil
condition of
Attica before
Solon.

¹ Pausan. i. 3, 2; Suidas, Ἰππομένης; Diogenian. Centur. Proverb. iii. l. Ἀσεβέστερον Ἰππομένους.

² See Boeckh on the Parian Marble, in Corp. Inscrip. Græc. part 12. sect. 6.

pp. 307, 310, 332.

From the beginning of the reign of Medôn son of Kodrus, to the first annual archon Kreôn, the Parian Marble computes 407 years, Eusebius 387.

the best evidences to be found respecting Athenian antiquity, since such practices often continued unaltered throughout all the political changes. It is in this way alone that we arrive at some partial knowledge of the ante-Solonian condition of Attica, though as a whole it still remains dark and unintelligible, even after the many illustrations of modern commentators.

Philochorus, writing in the third century before the Christian æra, stated, that Kekrops had originally distributed Attica into twelve districts—Kekropia, Tetrapolis, Epakria, Dekeleia, Eleusis, Aphidnæ, Thorikus, Braurôn, Kythêrus, Sphêttus, Kêphisia, Phalêrus—and that these twelve were consolidated into one political society by Theseus.¹ This partition does not comprise the Megarid, which, according to other statements, is represented as united with Attica, and as having formed part of the distribution made by king Pandiôn among his four sons, Nisus, Ægeus, Pallas and Lykus—a story as old as Sophoklês at least.² In other accounts, again, a quadruple division is applied to the tribes, which are stated to have been four in number, beginning from Kekrops—called in his time Kêkrôpis, Autochthon, Aktæa and Paralia. Under king Kranaus, these tribes (we are told) received the names of Kranaïs, Atthis, Meso-gæa and Diakria³—under Erichthonius, those of Dias, Athenaïs, Poseidonias, Hephæstias: at last, shortly after Erechtheus, they were denominated after the four sons of Iôn (son of Kreusa daughter of Erechtheus, by Apollo), Geleontes, Hoplêtes, Ægikoreis, Argadeis. The four Attic or Ionic tribes, under these last-mentioned names, continued to form the classification of the citizens until the revolution of Kleisthenês in 509 B.C., by which the ten tribes were introduced, as we find them down to the period of Macedonian ascendancy. It is affirmed, and with some etymological plausibility, that the denominations of these four tribes must originally have had reference to the occupations of those who bore them—the Hoplêtes being the *warrior-class*, the Ægikoreis *goatherds*, the Argadeis *artisans*, and the Geleontes (Teleontes, or Gedeontes) *cultivators*. Hence some authors have ascribed to the ancient inhabitants of Attica⁴

Alleged duodecimal division of Attica in early times.

Four Ionic tribes—
Geleontes,
Hoplêtes,
Ægikoreis,
Argadeis.

¹ Philochorus ap. Strabo. ix. p. 396. See Schömann, *Antiq. J. P. Græc.* b. v. sect. 2-5.

² Strabo, ix. p. 392. Philochorus and Andrôn extended the kingdom of Nisus from the isthmus of Corinth as far as the Pythium (near Cenoë) and Eleusis (*Str. ib.*); but there were many differ-

ent tales.

³ Pollux, viii. c. 9. 109-111.

⁴ Iôn, the father of the four heroes after whom these tribes were named, was affirmed by one story to be the primitive civilising legislator of Attica, like Lycurgus, Numa, or Deukaliôn (*Plutarch. adv. Kolôten*, c. 31. p. 1125).

an actual primitive distribution into hereditary professions or castes, similar to that which prevailed in India and Egypt. If we should even grant that such a division into castes might originally have prevailed, it must have grown obsolete long before the time of Solon: but there seem no sufficient grounds for believing that it ever did prevail. The names of the tribes may have been originally borrowed from certain professions, but it does not necessarily follow that the reality corresponded to this derivation, or that every individual who belonged to any tribe was a member of the profession from whence the name had originally been derived. From the etymology of the names, be it ever so clear, we cannot safely assume the historical reality of a classification according to professions. And this objection (which would be weighty even if the etymology had been clear) becomes irresistible when we add that even the etymology is not beyond dispute;¹ that the names themselves are written with a diversity which cannot be reconciled; and that the four professions named by Strabo omit the goat-herds and include the priests; while those specified by Plutarch leave out the latter and include the former.²

Not names
of castes or
professions.

All that seems certain is, that these were the four ancient Ionic tribes (analogous to the Hylleis, Pamphyli and Dymanes among the Dorians) which prevailed not only at Athens, but among several of the Ionic cities derived from Athens. The Geleontes are mentioned in inscriptions now remaining belonging to Teôs in Ionia, and all the four are named in those of Kyzikus in the Propontis, which was a foundation from the Ionic Miletus.³ The four tribes, and the four names (allowing for some variations of reading), are therefore historically verified. But neither the time of their introduction, nor their primitive import,

¹ Thus Euripides derives the Αἰγικο-
ρεῖς, not from αἶξ a goat, but from Αἶγλις
the Ægis of Athênê (Ion. 1581); he also
gives *Teleontes*, derived from an epony-
mous *Teleôn* son of Iôn, while the in-
scriptions at Kyzikus concur with Hero-
dotus and others in giving Geleontes.
Plutarch (Solon, 25) gives Gedeontes.
In an Athenian inscription recently pub-
lished by Professor Ross (dating seem-
ingly in the first century after the
Christian æra), the worship of Zeus
Geleôn at Athens has been for the first
time verified—Διὸς Γελέοντος ἱεροκήρυξ
(Ross, *Die Attischen Dæmonen*, pp. vii.-ix.
Halle, 1846).

² Plutarch (Solon, c. 25); Strabo,
viii. p. 383. Compare Plato, *Kritias*,

p. 110.

³ Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.* Nos. 3078,
3079, 3665. The elaborate commentary
on this last-mentioned inscription, in
which Boeckh vindicates the early his-
torical reality of the classification by
professions, is noway satisfactory to my
mind.

K. F. Hermann (*Lehrbuch der Grie-
chischen Staats Alterthümer*, sect. 91-
96) gives a summary of all that can be
known respecting these old Athenian
tribes. Compare Ilgen, *De Tribubus
Atticis*, p. 9 *seq.* Tittmann, *Griechische
Staats Verfassungen*, pp. 570-582; Wach-
smuth, *Hellenische Alterthumskunde*,
sect. 43, 44.

are ascertainable matters; nor can any faith be put in the various constructions of the legends of Iôn, Erechtheus, and Kekrops, by modern commentators.

These four tribes may be looked at either as religious and social aggregates, in which capacity each of them comprised three Phratries and ninety Gentes; or as political aggregates, in which point of view each included three Trittyes and twelve Naukraries. Each Phratry contained thirty Gentes: each Trittyes comprised four Naukraries: the total numbers were thus 360 Gentes and 48 Naukraries. Moreover each gens is said to have contained thirty heads of families, of whom therefore there would be a total of 10,800.

Comparing these two distributions one with the other, we may remark that they are distinct in their nature and proceed in opposite directions. The Trittyes and the Naukrary are essentially fractional subdivisions of the tribe, and resting upon the tribe as their higher unity: the Naukrary is a local circumscription, composed of the Naukrars or principal householders (so the etymology seems to indicate), who levy in each respective district the quota of public contributions which belongs to it, and superintend the disbursement,—provide the military force incumbent upon the district, being for each naukrary two horsemen and one ship,—and furnish the chief district-officers, the Prytanes of the Naukrari.¹ A certain number of foot soldiers, varying according to the demand, must probably be understood as accompanying these horsemen; but the quota is not specified, as it was, perhaps, thought unnecessary to limit precisely the obligations of any except the wealthier men who served on horse-

¹ About the Naukraries, see Aristot. Fragment. Rerum Public. p. 89, ed. Neumann; Harpokration, *vv. Δήμαρχος, Ναυκραρική*; Photius, *v. Ναυκραρία*; Pollux, viii. 108; Schol. ad Aristoph. Nubes, 37.

Οἱ *πρυτάνεις τῶν Ναυκραρίων*, Herodot. v. 71: they conducted the military proceedings in resistance to the usurpation of Kylon.

The statement that each Naukrary was obliged to furnish one ship can hardly be true of the time before Solon: as Pollux states it, we should be led to conceive that he only infers it from the name *ναύκραρος* (Pollux, viii. 108), though the real etymology seems rather to be from *ναῶν* (Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alt. sect. 44. p. 240). There may be

some ground for believing that the old meaning also of the word *ναύτης* connected it with *ναῶν*; such a supposition would smooth the difficulty in regard to the functions of the *ναυτοδίκαι* as judges in cases of illicit admission into the phratores. See Hesychius and Harpokration, *v. Ναυτοδίκαι*; and Baumstark, *De Curatoribus Emporii*, Friburg, 1828, p. 67 *seq.*; compare also the fragment of the Solonian law, *ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων ἢ ναῦται*, which Niebuhr conjecturally corrects. Rom. Gesch. v. i. p. 323, 2nd ed.; Hesychius, *Ναυστήρες—οἱ οἰκέται*. See Pollux, *Ναῦλον*, and Lobeck, *Ῥηματικόν*, sect. 3. p. 7; *Ἀειναῦται παρὰ Μιλησίοις*? Plutarch, *Quæst. Græc.* c. 32, p. 298.

back,—at a period when oligarchical ascendancy was paramount, and when the bulk of the people was in a state of comparative subjection. The forty-eight naukraries are thus a systematic subdivision of the four tribes, embracing altogether the whole territory, population, contributions, and military force of Attica,—a subdivision framed exclusively for purposes connected with the entire state.

But the Phratries and Gentes are a distribution completely different from this. They seem aggregations of small primitive unities into larger; they are independent of, and do not presuppose, the tribe; they arise separately and spontaneously, without preconcerted uniformity, and without reference to a common political purpose; the legislator finds them pre-existing, and adapts or modifies them to answer some national scheme. We must distinguish the general fact of the classification, and the successive subordination in the scale, of the families to the gens, of the gentes to the phratry, and of the phratries to the tribe—from the precise numerical symmetry with which this subordination is invested, as we read it,—thirty families to a gens, thirty gentes to a phratry, three phratries to each tribe. If such nice equality of numbers could ever have been procured, by legislative constraint¹ operating upon pre-existent natural elements, the proportions could not have been permanently maintained. But we may reasonably doubt whether it ever did so exist: it appears more like the fancy of an antiquary who pleased himself by supposing an original systematic creation in times anterior to records, by multiplying together the number of days in the month and of months in the year. That every phratry contained an equal number of gentes, and every gens an equal number of families, is a supposition hardly admissible without better evidence than we possess. But apart from this questionable precision of numerical scale, the Phratries and Gentes themselves were real, ancient, and durable associations among the Athenian people, highly important to be understood.² The basis of the whole was

The Phratry
and the
Gens.

¹ Meier, *De Gentilitate Atticâ*, pp. 22–24, conceives that this numerical completeness was enacted by Solon; but of this there is no proof, nor is it in harmony with the general tendencies of Solon's legislation.

² So in reference to the Anglo-Saxon *Tythings* and *Hundreds*, and to the still more widely-spread division of the *Hundred*, which seems to pervade the whole

of Teutonic and Scandinavian antiquity, much more extensively than the *tything*; —there is no ground for believing that these precise numerical proportions were in general practice realized: the systematic nomenclature served its purpose by marking the idea of graduation and the type to which a certain approach was actually made. Mr. Thorpe observes respecting the Hundred, in his

the house, hearth or family,—a number of which, greater or less, composed the Gens or Genos. This gens was therefore a clan, sept, or enlarged, and partly factitious, brotherhood, bound together by,—1. Common religious ceremonies, and exclusive privilege of priesthood, in honour of the same god, supposed to be the primitive ancestor and characterised by a special surname. 2. By a common burial-place. 3. By mutual rights of succession to property. 4. By reciprocal obligations of help, defence, and redress of injuries. 5. By mutual right and obligation to intermarry in certain determinate cases, especially where there was an orphan daughter or heiress. 6. By possession, in some cases at least, of common property, an archon and a treasurer of their own.

Such were the rights and obligations characterising the gentile union.¹ The phratric union, binding together several gentes, was less intimate, but still included some mutual rights and obligations of an analogous character; especially a communion of particular sacred rites, and mutual privileges of prosecution in the event of a phrator being slain. Each phratry was considered as belonging to one of the four tribes, and all the phratres of the same tribe enjoyed a certain periodical communion of sacred rites, under the presidency of a magistrate called the Phylo-Basileus or Tribe King, selected from the Eupatrids: Zeus Geleôn was in this manner the patron god of the tribe Geleontes. Lastly, all the four tribes were linked together by the common worship of Apollo Patrôus as their divine father and guardian; for Apollo was the father of Iôn, and the Eponyms of all the four tribes were reputed sons of Iôn.

Thus stood the primitive religious and social union of the population of Attica in its gradually ascending scale—as distinguished from the political union, probably of later introduction, represented at first by the Trittyes and Naukraries, and in after times

Glossary to the 'Ancient Laws and Institutions of England,' v. *Hundred, Tything, Frid-Borg*, &c. "In the *Dialogus de Scaccario*, it is said that a Hundred 'ex hydarum aliquot centenariis, sed non determinatis, constat: quidam enim ex pluribus, quidam ex paucioribus constat.' Some accounts make it consist of precisely a hundred hydes, others of a hundred tythings, others of a hundred free families. Certain it is, that whatever may have been its original organization, the Hundred, at the time when

it becomes known to us, differed greatly in extent in various parts of England."

¹ See the instructive inscription in Professor Ross's work (*Über die Deme von Attika*, p. 26) of the γένος Ἀμυνανδριδῶν, commemorating the archon of that gens, the priest of Kekrops, the *Tauias* or treasurer, and the names of the members, with the deme and tribe of each individual. Compare Bossler, *De Gent. Atticis*, p. 53. About the peculiar religious rites of the gens called Gephyraei, see Herodot. v. 61.

by the ten Kleisthenean tribes, subdivided into Trittyes and Demes. The religious and family bond of aggregation is the earlier of the two: but the political bond, though beginning later, will be found to acquire constantly increasing influence throughout the greater part of this history. In the former, personal relation is the essential and predominant characteristic¹—local relation being subordinate: in the latter, property and residence become the chief considerations, and the personal element counts only as measured along with these accompaniments. All these phratric and gentile associations, the larger as well as the smaller, were founded upon the same principles and tendencies of the Grecian mind²—a coalescence of the idea of worship with that of ancestry, or of communion in certain special religious rites with communion of blood, real or supposed. The god or hero, to whom the assembled members offered their sacrifices, was conceived as the primitive ancestor to whom they owed their origin; often through a long list of intermediate names, as in the case of the Milesian Hekataëus, so often before adverted to.³ Each family had its own sacred rites and funereal commemoration of ancestors, celebrated by the master of the house, to which none but members of the family were admissible: so that the extinction of a family, carrying with it the suspension of these religious rites, was held by

¹ Φυλαὶ γενικαὶ opposed to φυλαὶ τοπικαί.—Dionys. Hal. Ant. Rom. iv. 14.

² Plato, Euthydem. p. 302; Aristot. ap. Schol. in Platon. Axioch. p. 465, ed. Bek. 'Αριστοτέλης φησί· τοῦ ὅλου πλήθους διηρημένου Ἀθήνησιν εἰς τε τοὺς γεωργοὺς καὶ τοὺς δημιουργοὺς, φυλὰς αὐτῶν εἶναι τέσσαρας, τῶν δὲ φυλῶν ἑκάστης μοιρὰς εἶναι τρεῖς, ὥς τριτῆας τε καλοῦσι καὶ φρατρίας· ἑκάστης δὲ τούτων τριάκοντα εἶναι γένη, τὸ δὲ γένος ἐκ τριάκοντα ἀνδρῶν συνιστάναι· τούτους δὴ τοὺς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένους γεννήτας καλοῦσι. Pollux, viii. 3. Οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ γένους, γεννήται καὶ δημογάκτες· γένει μὲν οὐ προσήκοντες, ἐκ δὲ τῆς συνόδου οὕτω προσταγορέμενοι: compare also iii. 52; Mæris. Atticist. p. 108.

Harpokrat. v. Ἀπόλλων Πατῆρ, Θεόινον, Γεννήται, Ὀργεῶνες, &c. Etymol. Magn. v. Γεννήται; Suidas, v. Ὀργεῶνες; Pollux, viii. 85; Demosthen. cont. Eubulid. p. 1319. εἰτα φράτορες, εἰτα Ἀπόλλωνος πατρὸς καὶ Διὸς ἐρκίου γεννήται; and cont. Nearan, p. 1365. Isæus uses Ὀργεῶνες as synonymous with γεννήται (see Orat. ii. p. 19, 20–28, ed. Bek.). Schömann (Antiq. J. P. Græc.

§ xxvi.) considers the two as essentially distinct. Φρήτηρ and φύλον both occur in the Iliad, ii. 362. See the Dissertation of Buttmann, Ueber den Begriff von φρατρία (Mythologus, c. 24. p. 305); and that of Meier, De Gentilitate Atticâ, where the points of knowledge attainable respecting the Gentes are well put together and discussed.

In the Thersæan Inscription (No. 2448 ap. Boeckh. Corp. Inscr., see his comment, p. 310) containing the testament of Epiktêta, whereby a bequest is made to οἱ συγγενεῖς—ὁ ἀνδρεῖος τῶν συγγενῶν—this latter word does not mean kindred or blood relations, but a variety of the gentile union—"thiasus" or "sodalitium." Boeckh.

³ Herodot. i. 143. Ἐκαταίῳ—γενεηλογήσαντί τε ἑωυτὸν καὶ ἀναδήσαντί τὴν πατρίην ἐς ἑκκαίδεκατον θεόν. Again, γενεηλογήσαντι ἑωυτὸν, καὶ ἀναδήσαντι ἐς ἑκκαίδεκατον θεόν. The Attic expression—ἀγχίστεια ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων—illustrates the intimate association between family relationship and common religious privileges.—Isæus, Orat. vi. p. 89, ed. Bek.

the Greeks to be a misfortune, not merely from the loss of the citizens composing it, but also because the family gods and the names of deceased citizens were thus deprived of their honours¹ and might visit the country with displeasure. The larger associations, called Gens, Phratry, Tribe, were formed by an extension of the same principle—of the family considered as a religious brotherhood, worshipping some common god or hero with an appropriate surname, and recognising him as their joint ancestor; and the festivals Theoenia and Apaturia² (the first Attic, the second common to all the Ionic race) annually brought together the members of these phratries and gentes for worship, festivity, and maintenance of special sympathies; thus strengthening the larger ties without effacing the smaller.

Such were the manifestations of Grecian sociality, as we read them in the early constitution, not merely of Attica, but of other Grecian states besides. To Aristotle and Dikæarchus it was an interesting inquiry to trace back all political society into certain assumed elementary atoms, and to show by what motives and means the original families, each having its separate meal-bin and fireplace,³ had been brought together into larger aggregates.

¹ Isæus, Or. vi. p. 61; ii. p. 38; Demosth. adv. Makartatum, p. 1053–1075; adv. Leochar. p. 1093. Respecting this perpetuation of the family sacred rites, the feeling prevalent among the Athenians is much the same as what is now seen in China.

Mr. Davis observes—"Sons are considered in this country, where the power over them is so absolute through life, as a sure support, as well as a probable source of wealth and dignities, should they succeed in learning. But the grand object is, the perpetuation of the race, to sacrifice at the family tombs. Without sons, a man lives without honour or satisfaction, and dies unhappy; and as the only remedy, he is permitted to adopt the sons of his younger brothers.

"It is not during life only that a man looks for the service of his sons. It is his consolation in declining years, to think that they will continue the performance of the prescribed rites in the hall of ancestors, and at the family tombs, when he is no more; and it is the absence of this prospect which makes the childless doubly miserable. The superstition derives influence from the im-

portance attached by the government to this species of posthumous duty; a neglect of which is punishable, as we have seen, by the laws. Indeed, of all the subjects of their care, there are none which the Chinese so religiously attend to as the tombs of their ancestors, conceiving that any neglect is sure to be followed by worldly misfortune."—(The Chinese, by John Francis Davis, chap. ix. p. 131–134, ed. Knight, 1840.)

Mr. Mill notices the same state of feeling among the Hindoos.—(History of British India, book ii. chap. vii. p. 381, ed. 8vo.)

² Xenoph. Hellen. i. 5, 8; Herodot. i. 147; Suidas, Ἀπατούρια—Ζεὺς Φράτριος—Ἀθηνάια φρατρία, the presiding god of the phratric union.—Plato, Euthydem. c. 28. p. 302; Demosth. adv. Makart. p. 1054. See Meier, De Gentilitate Atticâ, p. 11–14.

The πατρίαι at Byzantium, which were different from θιασοί, and which possessed corporate property (τὰ τε θιασῶτικὰ καὶ τὰ πατριωτικὰ, Aristot. Economic. ii. 4), are doubtless the parallel of the Athenian phratries.

³ Dikæarchus ap. Stephen. Byz. v. Πατρά; Aristot. Polit. i. 1, 6; Ὁμοσι-

Artificial enlargement of the primitive family association. Ideas of worship and ancestry coalesce.

But the historian must accept as an ultimate fact the earliest state of things which his witnesses make known to him, and in the case now before us, the gentile and phratric unions are matters into the beginning of which we cannot pretend to penetrate.

Pollux (probably from Aristotle's lost work on the Constitutions of Greece) informs us distinctly that the members of the same gens at Athens were not commonly related by blood,—and even without any express testimony we might have concluded such to be the fact. To what extent the gens at the unknown epoch of its first formation was based upon actual relationship, we have no means of determining, either with regard to the Athenian or the Roman gentes, which were in all main points analogous. Gentilism is a tie by itself; distinct from the family ties, but presupposing their existence and extending them by an artificial analogy, partly founded in religious belief and partly on positive compact, so as to comprehend strangers in blood. All the members of one gens, or even of one phratry, believed themselves to be sprung, not indeed from the same grandfather or great-grandfather, but from the same divine or heroic ancestor. All the contemporary members of the phratry of Hekataeus had a common god for their ancestor in the sixteenth degree; and this fundamental belief, into which the Greek mind passed with so much facility, was adopted and converted by positive compact into the Gentile and Phratric principle of union. It is because such a transfusion, not recognised by Christianity, is at variance with modern habits of thought, and because we do not readily understand how such a legal and religious fiction can have sunk deep into the Greek feelings, that the Phratric and Gentes appear to us mysterious. But they are in harmony with all the legendary genealogies which have been set forth in the preceding volume. Doubtless Niebuhr, in his valuable discussion of the ancient Roman Gentes, is right in supposing that they were not real families, procreated from any common historical ancestor. Still it is not the less true (though he seems to suppose otherwise) that the idea of the gens involved *the belief* in a common first father, divine or heroic—a genealogy which we may properly call fabulous, but which was consecrated and accredited among the members of the gens itself, and served as one important bond of union between them.¹ And though an analytical mind

Belief in a common divine ancestor.

This ancestry fabulous, yet still accredited.

πῦος and ὁμοκάπριος are the old words cited by the latter from Charondas and Epimenidēs.

¹ Niebuhr, Römische Geschichte, vol. i. p. 317–337. Varro's language on that point is clear:—"Ut in hominibus quæ-

like Aristotle might discern the difference between the gens and the family, so as to distinguish the former as the offspring of some special compact—still this is no fair test of the feelings usual among early Greeks. Nor is it certain that Aristotle himself, son of the physician Nikomachus, who belonged to the gens of the Asklepiads,¹ would have consented to disallow the procreative origin of *all* these religious families without any exception. The natural families of course changed from generation to generation, some extending themselves while others diminished or died out; but the gens received no alterations, except through the procreation, extinction, or subdivision of these component families. Accordingly the relations of the families with the gens were in perpetual course of fluctuation, and the gentile ancestral genealogy, adapted as it doubtless was to the early condition of the gens, became in process of time partially obsolete and unsuitable. We hear of this genealogy but rarely, because it is only brought before the public in certain cases pre-eminent and venerable. But the humbler gentes had their common rites, and common superhuman ancestor and genealogy, as well as the more celebrated: the scheme and ideal basis was the same in all.

Analogies, borrowed from very different people and parts of the world, prove how readily these enlarged and factitious family unions assort with the ideas of an early stage of society. The Highland clan, the Irish sept,² the ancient legally

dam sunt cognationes et gentilitates, sic in verbis. Ut enim ab Æmilio homines orti Æmilli et gentiles, sic ab Æmilii nomine declinata voces in gentilitate nominali." Paul. Diacon. p. 94. "Gentilis dicitur ex eodem genere ortus, et is qui simili nomine appellatur," &c. See Becker, Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer, part 2. abth. 2. p. 36.

The last part of the definition ought to be struck out for the Grecian gentes. The passage of Varro does not prove the historical reality of the primitive father or Genarch Æmilius, but it proves that the members of the gens believed in him.

Dr. Wilda, in his learned work, 'Das Deutsche Strafrecht' (Halle, 1842), dissents from Niebuhr in the opposite direction, and seems to maintain that the Grecian and Roman gentes were really distant blood relations (p. 123). How this can be proved, I do not know: and it is inconsistent with the opinion which he advances in the preceding page (p.

122) very justly—that these *quasi* families are primordial facts in early human society, beyond which we cannot carry our researches. "The farther we go back in history, the more does the community exhibit the form of a family, though in reality it is *not* a mere family. This is the limit of historical research, which no man can transgress with impunity" (p. 122).

¹ Diogen. Laërt. v. 1.

² See Colonel Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, ch. 2. p. 85 (the Greek word *φάτρια* seems to be adopted in Albania); Boué, *La Turquie en Europe*, vol. ii. ch. i. p. 15–17; chap. 4. p. 530; Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland* (vol. vi. p. 1542–1543 of Tonson's edition of Spenser's Works, 1715); Cyprien Robert, *Die Slaven in Turkey*, b. 1. ch. 1 and 2.

So too, in the laws of King Alfred in England on the subject of murder, the guild-brethren or members of the same guild are made to rank in the position

constituted families in Friesland and Dithmarsch, the Phis or Phara among the Albanians, are examples of a similar practice :¹

of distant relatives if there happen to be no blood relatives :—

“If a man, kinless of paternal relatives, fight and slay a man, then if he have maternal relatives, let them pay a third of the wër: his guild-brethren a third part: for a third let him flee. If he have no maternal relatives, let his guild-brethren pay half: for half let him flee If a man kill a man thus circumstanced, if he have no relatives, let half be paid to the king, half to his guild-brethren.” (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, vol. i. p. 79–81.) Again, in the same work, Leges Henrici Primi, vol. i. p. 596, the ideas of the kindred and the guild run together in the most intimate manner: —“Si quis hominem occidat—Si eum tunc *cognatio sua* deserat, et pro eo *gildare* nolit,” &c. In the Salic law, the members of a *contubernium* were invested with the same rights and obligations one towards the other (Rogge, *Gerichtswesen der Germanen*, ch. iii. p. 62). Compare Wilda, *Deutsches Strafrecht*, p. 389, and the valuable special treatise of the same author (*Das Gildewesen in Mittelalter*, Berlin, 1831), where the origin and progress of the guilds from the primitive times of German heathenism is unfolded. He shows that these associations have their basis in the earliest feelings and habits of the Teutonic race—the family was as it were a natural guild—the guild, a factitious family. Common religious sacrifices and festivals—mutual defence and help, as well as mutual responsibility—were the recognised bonds among the *congildones*; they were *sororitates* as well as *fraternitates*, comprehending both men and women (deren Genossen wie die Glieder einer Familie eng unter einander verbunden waren, p. 145). Wilda explains how this primitive social and religious *phratry* (sometimes this very expression *fratria* is used, see p. 109) passed into something like the more political tribe or *phylë* (see pp. 43, 57, 60, 116, 126, 129, 344). The sworn *commune*, which spread so much throughout Europe in the beginning of the twelfth century, partakes both of the one and of the other—*conjuratio*—*amicitia jurata* (pp. 148, 169).

The members of an Albanian *phara* are all jointly bound to exact, and each severally exposed to suffer, the ven-

geance of blood, in the event of homicide committed upon, or by, any one of them (Boué, *ut supra*).

¹ See the valuable chapter of Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.* vol. i. pp. 317, 350, 2nd edit.

The *Alberghi* of Genoa in the middle ages were enlarged families created by voluntary compact:—“De tout temps (observe Sismondi) les familles puissantes avaient été dans l’usage, à Gênes, d’augmenter encore leur puissance en adoptant d’autres familles moins riches, moins illustres, ou moins nombreuses—auxquelles elles communiquoient leur nom et leurs armes, qu’elles prenoient ainsi l’engagement de protéger—et qui en retour s’associoient à toutes leurs querelles. Les maisons dans lesquelles on entroit ainsi par adoption, étoient nommées des alberghi (auberges), et il y avoit peu de maisons illustres qui ne se fussent ainsi recrutées à l’aide de quelque famille étrangère.” (*Républiques Italiennes*, t. xv. ch. 120. p. 366.)

Eichhorn (*Deutsche Staats und Rechtsgeschichte*, sect. 18. vol. i. p. 84, 5th edit.) remarks in regard to the ancient Germans, that the German “*familiæ et propinquitates*” mentioned by Tacitus (*Germ. c. 7*), and the “*gentibus cognationibusque hominum*” of Cæsar (*B. G. vi. 22*), bore more analogy to the Roman *gens* than to relationship of blood or wedlock. According to the idea of some of the German tribes, even blood-relationship might be formally renounced and broken off, with all its connected rights and obligations, at the pleasure of the individual: he might declare himself *ἐκποιητός*, to use the Greek expression. See the Titul. 63 of the Salic law as quoted by Eichhorn, *l. c.*

Professor Koutorga of St. Petersburg (in his *Essai sur l’Organisation de la Tribu dans l’Antiquité*, translated from Russian into French by M. Chopin, Paris 1839) has traced out and illustrated the fundamental analogy between the social classification, in early times, of Greeks, Romans, Germans, and Russians (see especially pp. 47, 213). Respecting the early history of Attica, however, many of his positions are advanced upon very untrustworthy evidence (see p. 123 seq.).

Among the Arab tribes in Algeria there are some which are supposed to

and the adoption of prisoners by the North American Indians, as well as the universal prevalence and efficacy of the ceremony of adoption in the Grecian and Roman world, exhibit to us a solemn formality under certain circumstances, originating an union and affections similar to those of kindred. Of this same nature were the Phraties and Gentes at Athens, the Curiae and Gentes at Rome. But they were peculiarly modified by the religious imagination of the ancient world, which always traced back the past time to gods and heroes : and religion thus supplied both the common genealogy as their basis, and the privileged communion of special sacred rites as means of commemoration and perpetuity. The Gentes, both at Athens and in other parts of Greece, bore a patronymic name, the stamp of their believed common paternity : we find the Asklepiadæ in many parts of Greece—the Aleuadæ in Thessaly—the Midylidæ, Psalychidæ, Blepsidæ, Euxenidæ, at Ægina—the Branchidæ at Miletus—the Nebridæ at Kôs—the Iamidæ and Klytiadæ at Olympia—the Akestoridæ at Argos—the Kinyradæ in Cyprus—the Penthilidæ at Mitylene¹—the Talthybiadæ at Sparta,—not less than the Kodridæ, Eumolpidæ, Phytalidæ, Lykomêdæ, Butadæ, Euneidæ, Hesychidæ, Brytiadæ, &c. in Attica.² To each of these corresponded a mythical ancestor more or less known, and passing for the first father as well as the eponymous hero of the gens—Kodrus, Eumolpus, Butes, Phyalus, Hesychus, &c.

The revolution of Kleisthenês in 509 B.C. abolished the old tribes for civil purposes, and created ten new tribes—leaving the phraties and gentes unaltered, but introducing the local distribution

be formed from the descendants, real or reputed, of some holy man or *marabout*, whose tomb, covered with a white dome, is the central point of the tribe. Sometimes a tribe of this sort is divided into *ferka* or sections, each of which has for its head or founder a son of the Tribe-eponymus or founder. Sometimes these tribes are enlarged, by adjunction or adoption of new elements; so that they become larger tribes, “formées à la fois par le développement de l'élément familial, et par l'agrégation d'éléments étrangers.”—“Tout cela se naturalise par le contact, et chacun des nouveaux venus prend la qualité d'Amri (homme des Beni Amer) tout aussi bien que les descendans d'Amr lui-même.” (Tableau de la Situation des Etablissements Français en Algérie, Mar. 1846, p. 393).

¹ Pindar, Pyth. viii. 53; Isthm. vi.

92; Nem. vii. 103; Strabo, ix. p. 421; Stephen. Byz. v. Kôs; Herodot. v. 44; vii. 134; ix. 37; Pausan. x. 1, 4; Kallimachus, Lavacr. Pallad. 33; Schol. Pindar. Pyth. ii. 27; Aristot. Pol. v. 8, 13; Ἀλευάδων τοὺς πρώτους, Plato, Menon. 1, which marks them as a numerous gens. See Buttmann, Dissert. on the Aleuadæ, in the Mythologus, vol. ii. p. 246. Bacchiadæ at Corinth, ἐδίδοσαν καὶ ἡγοντο ἐξ ἀλλήλων (Herod. v. 92).

² Harpokration, v. Ἑρεοβοντάδαι, Βοντάδαι; Thucyd. viii. 53; Plutarch, Theseus, 12; Themistoklês, 1; Demosth. cont. Neær. p. 1365; Polemo ap. Schol. ad Soph. Œdip. Kol. 489; Plutarch, Vit. X. Orator. p. 841–844. See the Dissertation of O. Müller, De Minervâ Poliade, c. 2.

according to demes or cantons, as the foundation of his new political tribes. A certain number of demes belonged to each of the ten Kleisthenean tribes (the demes in the same tribes were not usually contiguous, so that the tribe was not coincident with a definite circumscription), and the deme, in which every individual was then registered, continued to be that in which his descendants were also registered. But the gentes had no connexion, as such, with these new tribes, and the members of the same gens might belong to different demes.¹ It deserves to be remarked, however, that to a certain extent, in the old arrangement of Attica, the division into gentes coincided with the division into demes, *i.e.* it happened not unfrequently that the gennêtes (or members of the same gens) lived in the same canton, so that the name of the gens and the name of the deme was the same. Moreover, it seems that Kleisthenês recognised a certain number of new demes, to which he gave names derived from some important gens resident near the spot. It is thus that we are to explain the large number of the Kleisthenean demes which bear patronymic names.²

¹ Demosth. cont. Near. p. 1365. Tittmann (Griechische Staatsverfass. p. 277) thinks that every citizen, after the Kleisthenean revolution, was of necessity a member of some phratry, as well as of some deme: but the evidence which he produces is in my judgement insufficient. The ideas of the phratry and the tribe are often confounded together; thus the Ægeidæ of Sparta, whom Herodotus (iv. 149) calls a tribe, are by Aristotle called a Phratry, of Thebans (ap. Schol. ad Pindar. Isthm. vii. 18). Compare Wachsmuth, Hellenische Alterthumskunde, sect. 83, p. 17.

A great many of the demes seem to have derived their names from the shrubs or plants which grew in their neighbourhood (Schol. ad Aristophan. Plutus, 586, *Μυρρινούς, Πάμνουός, &c.*).

² For example, Æthalidæ, Butadæ, Kothôkidæ, Dædalidæ, Eiresidæ, Epieikidæ, Eræadæ, Eupyridæ, Echelidæ, Keiriadæ, Kydantidæ, Lakiadæ, Pambôtadæ, Perithoidæ, Persidæ, Semachidæ, Skambônidæ, Sybridæ, Titakidæ, Thyrgonidæ, Hybadæ, Thymæstadæ, Pæonidæ, Philaidæ, Chollidæ: all these names of demes, bearing the patronymic form, are found in Harpokration and Stephanus Byz. alone.

We do not know that the *Κεραμείς* ever constituted a *γένος*, but the name of the deme *Κεραμείς* is evidently given,

upon the same principle, to a place chiefly occupied by potters. The gens *Κοιρώνιδαι* are said to have been called *Φιλίεις* (? *Φλυεῖς*) and *Περιθοῖδαι* as well as *Κοιρώνιδαι*: the names of gentes and those of demes seem not always distinguishable.

The Butadæ, though a highly venerable gens, also ranked as a deme (see the Psephism about Lycurgus in Plutarch, Vit. X. Orator. p. 852): yet we do not know that there was any locality called Butadæ. Perhaps some of the names above noticed may be simply names of gentes, enrolled as demes, but without meaning to imply any community of abode among the members.

The members of a Roman gens occupied adjoining residences, on some occasions—to what extent we do not know (Heiberg, De Familiari Patriciorum Nexu, ch. 24, 25. Sleswic, 1829).

We find the same patronymic names of demes and villages elsewhere: in Kôs and Rhodes (Ross. Inscr. Gr. ined., No. 15–26. Halle, 1846); *Lêstadæ* in Naxos (Aristotle ap. Athenæ. viii. p. 348); *Botachidæ* at Tegea (Steph. Byz. in v.); *Branchidæ* near Miletus, &c.; and an interesting illustration is afforded, in other times and other places, by the frequency of the ending *ikon* in villages near Zurich in Switzerland,—Mezikon, Nennikon, Wezikon, &c. Blüntschli, in his history of Zurich,

There is one remarkable difference between the Roman and the Grecian gens, arising from the different practice in regard to naming. A Roman Patrician bore habitually three names—the gentile name, with one name following it to denote his family, and another preceding it peculiar to himself in that family. But in Athens, at least after the revolution of Kleisthenês, the gentile name was not employed: a man was described by his own single name, followed first by the name of his father and next by that of the deme to which he belonged,—as *Æschinês, son of Atromêtus, a Kothôkid*. Such a difference in the habitual system of naming tended to make the gentile tie more present to every one's mind at Rome than in the Greek cities.

Before the pecuniary classification of the Atticans introduced by Solon, the Phratryes and Gentes, and the Trittyes and Naukraries, were the only recognised bonds among them, and the only basis of legal rights and obligations, over and above the natural family. The gens constituted a close incorporation, both as to property and as to persons. Until the time of Solon, no man had any power of testamentary disposition. If he died without children, his gennêtes succeeded to his property,¹ and so they continued to do even after Solon, if he died intestate. An orphan girl might be claimed in marriage of right by any member of the gens, the nearest agnates being preferred;² if she was poor, and he did not choose to marry her himself, the law of Solon compelled him to provide her with a dowry proportional to his enrolled scale of property, and to give her out in marriage to another; and the magnitude of the dowry required to be given (large even as fixed by Solon and afterwards doubled) seems a proof that the law-giver intended indirectly to enforce actual marriage.³ If a man was murdered, first his near relations, next his gennêtes and phratryes, were both allowed and required to prosecute the crime at

Rights and obligations of the gentile and phratry brethren.

shows that these terminations are abridgements of *inghoven*, including an original patronymic element—indicating the primary settlement of members of a family, or of a band bearing the name of its captain, on the same spot (Blüntschli, *Staats und Rechts Geschichte der Stadt Zurich*, vol. i. p. 26).

In other inscriptions from the island of Kôs, published by Professor Ross, we have a deme mentioned (without name), composed of three coalescing gentes, "In hoc et sequente titulo alium jam deprehendimus *demum Coum*, e tribus gentibus appellatione patronymicâ con-

flatum, Antimachidarum, Ægiliensium, Archidarum." (Ross, *Inscript. Græc. Ined. Fascic. iii. No. 307. p. 44. Berlin, 1845.*) This is a specimen of the process systematically introduced by Kleisthenês in Attica.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 21. We find a common cemetery exclusively belonging to the gens and tenaciously preserved (Demosth. cont. Eubulid. p. 1307; Cicero, Legg. ii. 26).

² Demosth. cont. Makartat. p. 1068. See the singular additional proviso in Plutarch, Solon. c. 20.

³ See Meursius, *Themis Attica*, i. 13.

law;¹ while his fellow demots, or inhabitants of the same deme, did not possess the like right of prosecuting. All that we hear of the most ancient Athenian laws is based upon the gentile and phratric divisions, which are treated throughout as extensions of the family. It is to be observed that this division is completely independent of any property qualification—rich men as well as poor being comprehended in the same gens.² Moreover the different gentes were very unequal in dignity, arising chiefly from the religious ceremonies of which each possessed the hereditary and exclusive administration, and which, being in some cases considered as of pre-eminent sanctity in reference to the whole city, were therefore nationalized. Thus the Eumolpidæ and Kêrýkes, who supplied the Hierophant and superintended the mysteries of the Eleusinian Dêmêtêr—and the Butadæ, who furnished the priestess of Athênê Polias as well as the priest of Poseidôn Erechtheus in the acropolis—seem to have been revered above all the other gentes.³ When the name Bu-

¹ That this was the primitive custom, and that the limitation *μέχρις ἀνεψιῶν* (Meier, *De Bonis Damnatis*. p. 23, cites *ἀνεψιῶν καὶ φρατρίων*) was subsequently introduced (Demosth. cont. *Euergetes*, et *Mnesib.* p. 1161), we may gather from the law as it stands in Demosth. cont. *Makartatos*. p. 1069, which includes the phrators, and therefore, *à fortiori*, the *gennêtes* or gentiles.

The same word *γένος* is used to designate both the circle of nameable relatives, brothers, first cousins (*ἀγχιστεῖς*, Demosth. cont. *Makartatos*. c. 9. p. 1058), &c., going beyond the *oikos*—and the quasi-family or gens. As the gentile tie tended to become weaker, so the former sense of the word became more and more current, to the extinction of the latter. *Οἱ ἐν γένει* or *οἱ προσήκοντες* would have borne a wider sense in the days of *Drako* than in those of *Demosthenes*: *συγγενὴς* usually belongs to *γένος* in the narrower sense, *γεννήτης* to *γένος* in the wider sense, but *Isæus* sometimes uses the former word as an exact equivalent of the latter (Orat. vii. pp. 95, 99, 102, 103, Bekker). *Τριακᾶς* appears to be noted in *Pollux* as the equivalent of *γένος* or gens (viii. 111), but the word does not occur in the Attic orators, and we cannot make out its meaning with certainty: the inscription of the Deme of *Peiræus* given in *Boeckh*. (Corp. Insc. No. 101. p. 140) rather adds to the confusion by revealing the existence

of a *τριακᾶς* constituting the fractional part of a deme, and not connected with a gens: compare *Boeckh's Comment.* ad loc. and his *Addenda* and *Corrigenda*, p. 900.

Dr. Thirlwall translates *γένος*, house; which I cannot but think inconvenient, because that word is the natural equivalent of *oikos*—a very important word in reference to Attic feelings, and quite different from *γένος* (*Hist. of Greece*, vol. ii. p. 14. ch. 11). It will be found impossible to translate it by any known English word which does not at the same time suggest erroneous ideas: which I trust will be accepted as my excuse for adopting it untranslated into this history.

² *Demosthenes*, cont. *Makartatos*. l. c.

³ See *Æschines de Falsâ Legat.* p. 292. c. 46; *Lysias* cont. *Andokid.* p. 108; *Andokid.* de *Mysteriis*, p. 63, *Reiske*; *Deinarchus* and *Hellanicus* ap. *Harpokrat.* v. *Ἱεροφάντης*.

In case of crimes of impiety, particularly in offences against the sanctity of the Mysteries, the Eumolpidæ had a peculiar tribunal of their own number, before which offenders were brought by the king archon. Whether it was often used, seems doubtful. They had also certain unwritten customs of great antiquity, according to which they pronounced (*Demosthenes*, cont. *Androtion*, p. 601; *Schol.* ad *Demosth.* vol. ii. p. 137, *Reiske*; compare *Meier* and *Schömann*, *Der Attische Prozess*, p. 117).

taδæ was selected in the Kleisthenean arrangement as the name of a deme, the holy gens so called adopted the distinctive denomination of Eteobutadæ, or "The true Butadæ."¹

A great many of the ancient gentes of Attica are known to us by name; but there is only one phratry (the Achniadæ) whose title has come down to us.² These phratries and gentes probably never at any time included the whole population of the country—and the proportion not included in them tended to become larger and larger, in the times anterior to Kleisthenēs,³ as well as afterwards. They remained, under his constitution and throughout the subsequent history, as religious quasi-families or corporations, conferring rights and imposing liabilities which were enforced in the regular dikasteries, but not directly connected with the citizenship or with political functions: a man might be a citizen without being enrolled in any gens. The forty-eight Naukraries ceased to exist, for any important purposes, under his constitution. The deme, instead of the naukrary, became the elementary political division, for military and financial objects; while the demarch became the working local president, instead of the chief of the naukrars. The deme however was not coincident with a naukrary, nor the demarch with the previous chief of the naukrary, though they were analogous and constituted for the like purpose.⁴ While the naukraries had been only

The gens and phratry after the revolution of Kleisthenēs became extra-political.

The Butadæ also had certain old unwritten maxims (Androtion ap. Athenæ. ix. p. 374).

Compare Bossler, *De Gentibus et Familiis Atticæ*, p. 20, and Ostermann, *De Præconibus Græcor.* sect. 2 and 3 (Marpurg. 1845).

¹ Lycurgus the orator is described as τὸν δῆμον Βουτάδης, γένους τοῦ τῶν Ἑτεοβουταδῶν (Plutarch, *Vit. X. Orator.* p. 841).

² In an inscription (apud Boeckh. *Corpus Inscript.* No. 465).

Four names of the phratries at the Greek city of Neapolis, and six names out of the thirty Roman curiæ, have been preserved (Becker, *Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer*, p. 32; Boeckh, *Corp. Inscript.* ii. p. 650).

Each Attic phratry seems to have had its own separate laws and customs, distinct from the rest, τοῖς φράτορσι, κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνων νόμους (Isæus, *Or.* viii. p. 115, ed. Bek.; vii. p. 99: iii. p. 49).

Bossler (*De Gentibus et Familiis Atticæ*, Darmstadt, 1833), and Meier

(*De Gentilitate Atticâ*, p. 41–54) have given the names of those Attic gentes that are known: the list of Meier comprises seventy-nine in number (see Kourtorga, *Organis.* Trib. p. 122).

³ Tittmann (*Griech. Staats Alterthümer*, p. 271) is of opinion that Kleisthenēs augmented the number of phratries, but the passage of Aristotle brought to support this opinion is insufficient proof (*Polit.* vi. 2, 11). Still less can we agree with Platner (*Beyträge zur Kenntniss des Attischen Rechts*, p. 74–77), that three new phratries were assigned to each of the new Kleisthenean tribes.

Allusion is made in Hesychius, Ἀτρίδ-καστοί, Ἐξω τριακᾶδος, to persons not included in any gens, but this can hardly be understood to refer to times anterior to Kleisthenēs, as Wachsmuth would argue (p. 238).

⁴ The language of Photius on this matter (v. *Ναυκραρία μὲν ὁ ποῖόν τι ἡ συμμορία καὶ ὁ δῆμος· ναύκρατος δὲ ὁποῖόν τι ὁ δήμαρχος*) is more exact than that of Harpokration, who identifies the two

forty-eight in number, the demes formed smaller subdivisions, and (in later times at least) amounted to a hundred and seventy-four.¹

But though this early quadruple division into tribes is tolerably intelligible in itself, there is much difficulty in reconciling it with that severalty of government which we learn to have originally prevailed among the inhabitants of Attica. From Kekrops down to Theseus (says Thucydides) there were many different cities in Attica, each of them autonomous and self-govern-
Many distinct political communities originally in Athens.—Theseus.
 ing, with its own prytaneium and its own archons. It was only on occasions of some common danger that these distinct communities took counsel together under the authority of the Athenian kings, whose city at that time comprised merely the holy rock of Athênê on the plain² (afterwards so conspicuous as the acropolis of the enlarged Athens), together with a narrow area under it on the southern side. It was Theseus (he states) who effected that great revolution whereby the whole of Attica was consolidated into one government—all the local magistracies and councils being made to centre in the prytaneium and senate of Athens. His combined sagacity and power enforced upon all the inhabitants of Attica the necessity of recognising Athens as the one city in the country, and of occupying their own abodes simply as constituent portions of Athenian territory. This important move, which naturally produced a great extension of the central city, was commemorated throughout the historical times by the Athenians in the periodical festival called Synœkia, in honour of the goddess Athênê.³

Such is the account which Thucydides gives of the original severalty and subsequent consolidation of the different portions of Attica. Of the general fact there is no reason to doubt, though the operative cause assigned by the historian—the power and sagacity of Theseus—belongs to legend and not to history. Nor can

completely—*v. Δήμαρχος*. If it be true that the naukraries were continued under the Kleisthenean constitution, with the alteration that they were augmented to fifty in number, five to every Kleisthenean tribe, they must probably have been continued in name alone without any real efficiency or functions. Kleidêmus makes this statement, and Boeckh follows it (*Public Economy of Athens*, 1. ii. ch. 21. p. 256): yet I cannot but doubt its correctness. For the *τριτὴς* (one-third of a Kleisthenean tribe) was certainly retained and was a working and available

division (see Dêmosthenês de Symmoriis, c. 7. p. 184), and it seems hardly probable that there should be two co-existing divisions, one representing the third part, the other the fifth part, of the same tribes.

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 396.

² Strabo, ix. p. 396, *πετὰ ἐν πεδίῳ περιοικουμένη κύκλῳ*. Euripid. *Ion*, 1578, *σκόπελον οὐ ναῖουσ' ἐμόν* (Athênê).

³ Thucyd. ii. 15; Theophrast. *Character*, 29, 4. Plutarch (*Theseus*, 24) gives the proceedings of Theseus in greater detail, and with a stronger tinge of democracy.

we pretend to determine either the real steps by which such a change was brought about, or its date, or the number of portions which went to constitute the full-grown Athens—further enlarged at some early period, though we do not know when, by voluntary junction of the Bœotian or semi-Bœotian town Eleutheræ, situated among the valleys of Kithærôn between Eleusis and Platæa. It was the standing habit of the population of Attica, even down to the Peloponnesian war,¹ to reside in their several cantons, where their ancient festivals and temples yet continued as relics of a state of previous autonomy. Their visits to the city were made only at

Long continuance of the cantonal feeling.

special times, for purposes religious or political, and they still looked upon the country residence as their real home.

How deep-seated this cantonal feeling was among them, we may see by the fact that it survived the temporary exile forced upon them by the Persian invasion, and was resumed when the expulsion of that destroying host enabled them to rebuild their ruined dwellings in Attica.²

How many of the demes recognised by Kleisthenês had originally separate governments, or in what local aggregates they stood combined, we cannot now make out. It must be recollected that the city of Athens itself contained several demes, while Peiræus also formed a deme apart. Some of the twelve divisions, which Philochorus ascribes to Kekrops, present probable marks of an ancient substantive existence—Kekropia, or the region surrounding and including the city and acropolis; the Tetrapolis, composed of Cenoê, Trykorythus, Probalinthus and Marathon;³ Eleusis;

¹ Pausan. i. 2, 4; 38, 2. Diodor. Sicul. iv. 2. Schol. ad Aristophan. Acharn. 242.

The Athenians transferred from Eleutheræ to Athens both a venerable statue of Dionysus and a religious ceremony in honour of that god. The junction of the town with Athens is stated by Pausanias to have taken place in consequence of the hatred of its citizens for Thebes, and must have occurred before 509 B.C., about which period we find Hysiaë to be the frontier deme of Attica (Herodot. v. 72; vi. 108).

² Thucyd. ii. 15, 16. οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ πόλιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολείπων ἕκαστος—respecting the Athenians from the country who were driven into Athens at the first invasion during the Peloponnesian war.

³ Etymologicon Magn. v. Ἐπακρία χωρά; Strabo, viii. p. 383; Stephan.

Byz. v. Τετράπολις.

The τετράκωμοι comprised the four demes, Πειραίαις, Φαληρεῖς, Ξυπετεῶνες, Θυμοίπαδαι (Pollux, iv. 105): whether this is an old division, however, has been doubted (see Ilgen, De Tribubus Atticis, p. 51).

The Ἐπακρέων τριττὺς is mentioned in an inscription apud Ross (Die Demen von Attika, p. vi.). Compare Boeckh ad Corp. Inscr. no. 82: among other demes, it comprised the deme Plôtheia. Mesogæa also (or rather the Mesogei, οἱ Μεσόγειοι) appears as a communion for sacrifice and religious purposes, and as containing the deme Batê. See Inscriptions Atticæ nuper repertæ duodecim, by Ern, Curtius; Berlin, 1843: Inscript. i. p. 3. The exact site of the deme Batê in Attica is unknown (Ross, Die Demen von Attika, p. 64): and respecting the question, what portion of Attica was

Aphidnæ and Dekeleia,¹ both distinguished by their peculiar mythical connexion with Sparta and the Dioskuri. But it is difficult to imagine that Phalêrum (which is one of the separate divisions named by Philochorus) can ever have enjoyed an autonomy apart from Athens. Moreover we find among some of the demes which Philochorus does not notice, evidences of standing antipathies, and prohibitions of intermarriage, which might seem to indicate that these had once been separate little states.² Though in most cases we can infer little from the legends and religious ceremonies which nearly every deme³ had peculiar to itself, yet those of Eleusis are so remarkable, as to establish the probable autonomy of that township down to a comparatively late period. The Homeric hymn to Dêmêtêr, recounting the visit of that goddess to Eleusis after the abduction of her daughter, and the first establishment of the Eleusinian ceremonies, specifies the eponymous prince Eleusis, and the various chiefs of the place—Keleos, Triptolemus, Dioklês, and Eumolpus. It also notices the Rharian plain in the neighbourhood of Eleusis. But not the least allusion is made to Athens or to any concern of the Athenians in the presence or worship of the goddess. There is reason to believe that at the time when this hymn was composed, Eleusis was an independent town: what that time was, we have no means of settling, though Voss puts it as low as the 30th Olympiad.⁴ And the proof hence derived is so much the more valuable, because the hymn to Dêmêtêr presents a colouring strictly special and local: moreover the story told by Solon to Croesus, respecting Tellus the Athenian who perished in battle against the neighbouring townsmen of Eleusis,⁵ assumes in like manner the independence of the latter in earlier times. Nor is it unimportant to notice, that

What demes were originally independent of Athens.—Eleusis.

called Mesogæa, very different conjectures have been started, which there appears to be no means of testing. Compare Schömann de Comitibus, p. 343, and Wordsworth, Athens and Attica, p. 229, 2nd edit.

¹ Dikæarchus, Fragm. p. 109, ed. Fuhr.; Plutarch, Theseus, c. 33.

² Such as that between the Pallênæans and Agnusians (Plutarch, Theseus, 12).

Acharnæ was the largest and most populous deme in Attica (see Ross, Die Deme von Attika, p. 62; Thucyd. ii. 21); yet Philochorus does not mention it as having ever constituted a substantive πόλις.

Several of the demes seem to have stood in repute for peculiar qualities, good or bad: see Aristophan. Acharn. 177, with Elmsley's note.

³ Strabo, ix. p. 396; Plutarch, Theseus, 14. Polemo had written a book expressly on the eponymous heroes of the Attic demes and tribes (Preller, Polemonis Fragm. p. 42): the Atticographers were all rich on the same subject: see the Fragments of the Atthis of Hellanikus (p. 24, ed. Preller), also those of Istrus, Philochorus, &c.

⁴ J. H. Voss, Erläuterungen, p. 1; see the hymn, 96–106, 451–475: compare Hermesianax ap. Athen. xiii. p. 597.

⁵ Herodot. i. 30.

even so low as 300 B.C. the observant visitor Dikæarchus professes to detect a difference between the native Athenians and the Atticans, as well in physiognomy as in character and taste.¹

In the history set forth to us of the proceedings of Theseus, no mention is made of these four Ionic tribes; but another Eupatridæ, Geōmori, and Demiurgi. and a totally different distribution of the people into Eupatridæ, Geōmori and Demiurgi, which he is said to have first introduced, is brought to our notice: Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives only a double division—Eupatridæ and dependent cultivators; corresponding to his idea of the patricians and clients in early Rome.² As far as we can understand this triple distinction, it seems to be disparate and unconnected with the four tribes above-mentioned. The Eupatridæ are the wealthy and powerful men, belonging to the most distinguished families in all the various gentes, and principally living in the city of Athens, after the consolidation of Attica: from them are distinguished the middling and lower people, roughly classified into husbandmen and artisans. To the Eupatridæ is ascribed a religious as well as a political and social ascendancy. They are represented as the source of all authority on matters both sacred and profane;³ they doubtless comprised those gentes, such as the Butadæ, whose sacred ceremonies were looked upon with the greatest reverence by the people; and we may conceive Eumolpus, Keleos, Dioklēs, &c., as they are described in the Homeric hymn to Dēmêtêr, in the character of Eupatridæ of Eleusis. The humbler gentes, and the humbler members of each gens, would appear in this classification confounded with that portion of the people who belonged to no gens at all.

From these Eupatridæ exclusively, and doubtless by their selection, the nine annual archons—probably also the Prytanes of the Naukrari—were taken. That the senate of Areopagus was formed of members of the same order, we may naturally presume. The nine archons all passed into it at the expiration of their year of office, subject only to the condition of having duly passed the test of accountability; and they remained

¹ Dikæarch. Vita Græciæ, p. 141, Fragm. ed. Fuhr.

² Plutarch, Theseus, c. 25; Dionys. Hal. ii. 8.

³ Etymologic. Magn. Εὐπατρίδαι — οἱ αὐτὸ τὸ ἔστυ οἰκοῦντες, καὶ μετέχοντες τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιοῦμενοι. The βασιλικὸν

γένος includes not only the Kodrids but also the Erechtheids, Pandionids, Pallantids, &c. See also Plutarch, Theseus, c. 24; Hesychius, Ἀγροῖῶται.

Yet Isokratēs seems to speak of the great family of the Alkmæonidæ as not included among the Eupatridæ (Orat. xvi. De Bigis, p. 351, p. 506 Bek.).

members for life. These are the only political authorities of whom we hear in the earliest imperfectly known period of the Athenian government, after the discontinuance of the king, and the adoption of the annual change of archons. The senate of Areopagus seems to represent the Homeric council of old men;¹ and there were doubtless, on particular occasions, general assemblies of the people, with the same formal and passive character as the Homeric agora—at least we shall observe traces of such assemblies anterior to the Solonian legislation. Some of the writers of antiquity ascribed the first establishment of the senate of Areopagus to Solon, just as there were also some who considered Lycurgus as having first brought together the Spartan Gerusia. But there can be little doubt that this is a mistake, and that the senate of Areopagus is a primordial institution, of immemorial antiquity, though its constitution as well as its functions underwent many changes. It stood at first alone as a permanent and collegiate authority, originally by the side of the kings and afterwards by the side of the archons. It would then of course be known by the title of *The Boulê*—*The senate or council*; its distinctive title, “Senate of Areopagus” (borrowed from the place where its sittings were held), would not be bestowed until the formation by Solon of the second senate or council, from which there was need to discriminate it.

This seems to explain the reason why it was never mentioned in the ordinances of Drako, whose silence supplied one argument in favour of the opinion that it did not exist in his time, and that it was first constituted by Solon.² We hear of the senate of Areopagus chiefly as a judicial tribunal, because it acted in this character constantly throughout Athenian history, and because the orators have most frequent occasion to allude to its decisions on matters of trial. But its functions were originally of the widest senatorial character, directive generally as well as judicial. And although the gradual increase of democracy at Athens (as will be hereafter explained) both abridged its powers and contributed still further comparatively to lower it, by enlarging the direct working of the people in assembly and judicature, as well as that of the senate of Five Hundred, which was a permanent adjunct and auxiliary of the public assembly—yet it seems to have been, even down to the time

¹ Meier und Schömann, *Der Attische Prozess*. Einleitung. p. 10.

² Plutarch, *Solon*, c. 19; Aristotle, *Polit.* ii. 9, 2; Cicero, *De Offic.* i. 22.

Pollux seems to follow the opinion that Solon first instituted the senate of Areopagus (viii. 125).

of Periklês, the most important body in the state. And after it had been cast into the background by the political reforms of that great man, we still find it on particular occasions stepping forward to reassert its ancient powers, and to assume for the moment that undefined interference which it had enjoyed without dispute in antiquity. The attachment of the Athenians to their ancient institutions gave to the senate of Areopagus a constant and powerful hold on their minds, and this feeling was rather strengthened than weakened when it ceased to be an object of popular jealousy—when it could no longer be employed as an auxiliary of oligarchical pretensions.

Of the nine archons, whose number continued unaltered from 683 B.C. to the end of the free democracy, three bore special titles—the Archon Eponymus, from whose name the designation of the year was derived, and who was spoken of as *The Archon*; the Archon Basileus (king), or more frequently, the Basileus; and the Polemarch. The remaining six passed by the general title of Thesmothetæ. Of the first three, each possessed exclusive judicial competence in regard to certain special matters: the Thesmothetæ were in this respect all on a par, acting sometimes as a board, sometimes individually. The Archon Eponymus determined all disputes relative to the family, the gentile, and the phratric relations: he was the legal protector of orphans and widows.¹ The Archon Basileus (or king archon) enjoyed competence in complaints respecting offences against the religious sentiment and respecting homicide. The Polemarch (speaking of times anterior to Kleisthenês) was the leader of the military force and judge in disputes between citizens and non-citizens. Moreover each of these three archons had particular religious festivals assigned to him, which it was his duty to superintend and conduct. The six Thesmothetæ seem to have been judges in disputes and complaints, generally, against citizens, saving the special matters reserved for the cognizance of the first two archons. According to the proper sense of the word Thesmothetæ, all the nine archons were entitled to be so called,² though the first three had especial designations of their

¹ Pollux, viii. 89–91.

² We read the *θεσμοθέτων ἀνάκρισις* in Demosthen. cont. Eubulidem, c. 17. p. 1319, and Pollux, viii. 85; a series of questions which it was necessary for them to answer before they were admitted to occupy their office. Similar questions must have been put to the

Archon, the Basileus, and the Polemarch: so that the words *θεσμοθέτων ἀνάκρισις* may reasonably be understood to apply to all the nine archons, as indeed we find the words *τοὺς ἐννέα ἀρχοντας ἀνακρίνετε* shortly afterwards, p. 1320. Besides, all the nine, after passing the *εὐθύναι* at the close of their

own. The word *Thesmoî* (analogous to the *Themistes*¹ of Homer) includes in its meaning both general laws and particular sentences—the two ideas not being yet discriminated, and the general law being conceived only in its application to some particular case. Drako was the first Thesmothet who was called upon to set down his *Thesmoi* in writing, and thus to invest them essentially with a character of more or less generality.

In the later and better-known times of Athenian law, we find these archons deprived in great measure of their powers of judging and deciding, and restricted to the task of first hearing the parties and collecting the evidence, next, of introducing the matter for trial into the appropriate *dikastery*, over which they presided. But originally there was no separation of powers; the archons both judged and administered, sharing among themselves those privileges which had once been united in the hands of the king, and probably accountable at the end of their year of office to the senate of *Areopagus*. It is probable also that the functions of that senate, and those of the *prytanes* of the *naukrars*, were of the same double and confused nature. All of these functionaries belonged to the *Eupatrids*, and all of them doubtless acted more or less in the narrow interest of their order: moreover there was ample room for favouritism, in the way of connivance, as well as antipathy, on the part of the archons. That such was decidedly the case, and that discontent began to be serious, we may infer from the duty imposed on the thesmothet Drako, B.C. 624, to put in writing the *Thesmoi* or Ordinances, so that they might be “shown publicly” and known beforehand.² He did not meddle with the political constitution, and in his ordinances Aristotle finds little

Drako and
his laws.

official year, became members of the *Areiopagus*.

¹ Respecting the word *θέμιστες* in the Homeric sense, see above, ch. xx.

Both Aristotle (*Polit.* ii. 9, 9) and *Démôsthénès* (contr. *Euerg.* et *Mnésibul.* c. 18. p. 1161) call the ordinances of Drako *νόμοι*, not *θεσμοί*. *Andokidès* distinguishes the *θεσμοί* of Drako and the *νόμοι* of Solon (*De Mysteriis*, p. 11). This is the adoption of a phrase comparatively modern; Solon called his own laws *θεσμοί*. The oath of the *περίπολοι ἔφηβοι* (the youth who formed the armed police of Attica during the first two years of their military age), as given in *Pollux* (vii. 106), seems to contain many ancient phrases: this

phrase—*καὶ τοῖς θεσμοῖς τοῖς ἰδρυμένοις πέλομαι*—is remarkable, as it indicates the ancient association of religious sanction which adhered to the word *θεσμοί*; for *ἰδρύνεσθαι* is the word employed in reference to the establishment and domestication of the gods who protected the country—*θέσθαι νόμους* is the later expression for making laws. Compare *Stobæus De Republic.* xliii. 48, ed. *Gaisford*, and *Démôsthen.* cont. *Makar.* *tat.* c. 13. p. 1069.

² “Ὅτε θεσμός ἐφάνη ὃδε—such is the exact expression of Solon’s law (*Plutarch*, *Solon*, c. 19); the word *θεσμός* is found in Solon’s own poems, *θεσμούς δ’ ὁμοίους τῷ κακῷ τε καὶ ἀγαθῷ*.

worthy of remark except the extreme severity¹ of the punishments awarded: petty thefts, or even proved idleness of life, being visited with death or disfranchisement.

But we are not to construe this remark as demonstrating any special inhumanity in the character of Drako, who was not invested with the large power which Solon afterwards enjoyed, and cannot be imagined to have imposed upon the community severe laws of his own invention. Himself of course an Eupatrid, he set forth in writing such ordinances as the Eupatrid archons had before been accustomed to enforce without writing, in the particular cases which came before them; and the general spirit of penal legislation had become so much milder, during the two centuries which followed, that these old ordinances appeared to Aristotle intolerably rigorous. Probably neither Drako, nor the Lokrian Zaleukus, who somewhat preceded him in date, were more rigorous than the sentiment of the age: indeed the few fragments of the Drakonian tables which have reached us, far from exhibiting indiscriminate cruelty, introduce, for the first time, into the Athenian law, mitigating distinctions in respect to homicide;² founded on the variety of concomitant circumstances. He is said to have constituted the judges called Ephetæ, fifty-one elders belonging to some respected gens or possessing an exalted position, who held their sittings for trial of homicide in three different spots, according to the difference of the cases submitted to them. If the accused party, admitting the fact, denied any culpable intention and pleaded accident, the case was tried at the place called the Palladium; when found guilty of accidental homicide, he was condemned to a temporary exile, unless he could appease the relatives of the deceased, but his property was left untouched. If, again, admitting the fact, he defended himself by some valid ground of justification, such as self-defence, or flagrant adultery with his wife on the part of the deceased, the trial took place on ground consecrated to Apollo and Artemis, called the Delphinium. A particular spot called the Phreattys, close to the seashore, was also named for the trial of a

Different
tribunals for
homicide at
Athens.

¹ Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 9; Rhetoric. ii. 25, 1; Aulus Gell. N. A. xi. 18; Pausanias, ix. 36, 4; Plutarch, Solon. c. 19; though Pollux (viii. 42) does not agree with him. Taylor, Lectt. Lysiacæ, ch. 10.

Respecting the *θεσμοί* of Drako, see Kuhn. ad Ælian. V. H. viii. 10. The preliminary sentence which Porphyry

(De Abinentiâ, iv. 22) ascribes to Drako can hardly be genuine.

² Pausanias, ix. 36, 4. Δράκοντος Ἀθηναίους θεσμοθετήσαντος ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνου κατέστη νόμων οὓς ἔγραψεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἄλλων τε ὅπως ἔδειαν εἶναι χρή, καὶ δὴ καὶ τιμωρίας μοιχοῦ; compare Dēmosten. cont. Aristokrat. p. 637; Lysias de Cæde Eratosthen. p. 31.

person, who while under sentence of exile for an unintentional homicide, might be charged with a second homicide, committed of course without the limits of the territory : being considered as impure from the effects of the former sentence, he was not permitted to set foot on the soil, but stood his trial on a boat hauled close in shore. At the Prytaneium or government-house itself, sittings were held by the four Phylo-Basileis or Tribe Kings, to try any inanimate object (a piece of wood or stone, &c.) which had caused death to any one, without the proved intervention of a human hand : the wood or stone, when the fact was verified, was formally cast beyond the border.¹ All these distinctions of course imply the preliminary investigation of the case (called *Anakrisis*) by the king archon, in order that it might be known what was the issue and where the sittings of the Ephetæ were to be held.

So intimately was the mode of dealing with homicide connected with the religious feelings of the Athenians, that these old regulations, never formally abrogated throughout the historical times,

¹ Harpokration, *vv.* 'Εφέται, 'Επὶ Δελφινίῳ, 'Επὶ Παλλαδίῳ, 'Εν Φρεαττοῖ; Pollux, viii. 119, 124, 125; Photius, v. 'Εφέται; Hesychius, *ἐς Φρέατον*; Dēmosthen. cont. Aristokrat. c. 15–18. p. 642–645; cont. Makartat. c. 13. p. 1068. When Pollux speaks of the five courts in which the Ephetæ judged, he probably includes the Areopagus (see Dēmosthen. cont. Aristokrat. c. 14. p. 641).

About the judges *ἐν Φρεαττοῖ*, see Aristot. Polit. iv. 13, 2. On the general subject of this ancient and obscure criminal procedure, see Matthiæ, *De Judiciis Atheniensium* (in *Miscellan. Philologie*, vol. i. p. 143 *seq.*); also Schömann, *Antiq. Jur. Pub. Att.* sect. 61. p. 288; Platner, *Prozess und Klagen bey den Attikern*, b. i. ch. 1; and E. W. Weber, *Comment. ad Dēmosthen.* cont. Aristokrat. pp. 627, 641; Meier und Schömann, *Attisch. Prozess*, p. 14–19.

I cannot consider the Ephetæ as judges in appeal, and I agree with those (Schömann, *Antiq. Jur. Pub. Gr.* p. 171; Meier und Schömann, *Attisch. Prozess*, p. 16; Platner, *Prozess und Klagen*, t. i. p. 18) who distrust the etymology which connects this word with *ἐφέσιμος*. The active sense of the word, akin to *ἐφίεμαι* (*Æsch. Prom.* 4) and *ἐφετμή*, meets the case better: see O. Müller, *Prolegg. ad Mythol.* p. 424 (though there is no reason for believing the Ephetæ to be older than Drako): com-

pare however K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staats Alterthümer*, sect. 103, 104, who thinks differently.

The trial, condemnation and banishment of inanimate objects which had been the cause of death, was founded on feelings widely diffused throughout the Grecian world (see Pausan. vi. 11, 2; and Theokritus, *Idyll.* xxiii. 60): analogous in principle to the English law respecting deodand, and to the spirit pervading the ancient Germanic codes generally (see Dr. C. Trümmer, *Die Lehre von der Zurechnung*, c. 28–38. Hamburg, 1845).

The Germanic codes do not content themselves with imposing a general obligation to appease the relatives and gentiles of the slain party, but determine beforehand the sum which shall be sufficient for the purpose, which, in the case of involuntary homicide, is paid to the surviving relatives as a compensation. As to the difference between culpable homicide, justifiable homicide, and accidental homicide, see the elaborate treatise of Wilda, *Das Deutsche Strafrecht*, ch. viii. p. 544–559, whose doctrine however is disputed by Dr. Trümmer in the treatise above noticed.

At Rome, according to the Twelve Tables and earlier, involuntary homicide was to be expiated by the sacrifice of a ram (Walter, *Geschichte des Römisch. Rechts*, sect. 768).

were read engraved on their column by the contemporaries of Dêmostenês.¹ The Areopagus continued in judicial operation, and the Ephetæ are spoken of as if they were so, even through the age of Dêmostenês; though their functions were tacitly usurped or narrowed, and their dignity impaired,² by the more popular dikasteries afterwards created. It is in this way that they have become known to us, while the other Drakonian institutions have perished: but there is much obscurity respecting them, particularly in regard to the relation between the Ephetæ and the Areopagites. Indeed so little was known on the subject, even by the historical inquirers of Athens, that most of them supposed the council of Areopagus to have received its first origin from Solon; and even Aristotle, though he contradicts this view, expresses himself in no very positive language.³ That judges sat at the Areopagus for the trial of homicide, previous to Drako, seems implied in the arrangements of that lawgiver respecting the Ephetæ, inasmuch as he makes no new provision for trying the direct issue of intentional homicide, which, according to all accounts, fell within the cognizance of the Areopagus: but whether the Ephetæ and the Areopagites were the same persons, wholly or partially, our information is not sufficient to discover. Before Drako, there existed no tribunal for trying homicide, except the senate, sitting at the Areopagus. And we may conjecture that there was something connected with that spot—legends, ceremonies, or religious feelings—which compelled judges there sitting to condemn every man proved guilty of homicide, and forbade them to take account of extenuating or justifying circumstances.⁴ Drako appointed the Ephetæ to sit at different places; places so pointedly marked, and so unalterably maintained, that we may see in how peculiar a manner those special

Regulations
of Drako
about the
Ephetæ.

¹ Dêmosth. cont. Euerg. et Mnêsib. p. 1161.

² Dêmosten. cont. Aristokrat. p. 647. τοσοῦτοις δικαστηρίοις, ἃ θεοὶ κατέδειξαν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἄνθρωποι χρώνται πάντα τὸν χρόνον, p. 643.—οἱ ταῦτ' ἐξαρχῆς τὰ νόμιμα διαθέντες, οἵτινές ποθ' ἦσαν, εἴθ' ἦσαν, εἴτε θεοί. See also the Oration cont. Makartat. p. 1069; Æschin. cont. Ktesiphon, p. 636; Antiph. De Cæde Herodis, c. 14.

The popular Dikastery, in the age of Isokratês and Dêmostenês, held settings ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ for the trial of charges of unintentional homicide—a striking evidence of the special holiness

of the place for that purpose (see Isokrat. cont. Kallimachum, Or. xviii. p. 381; Dêmosth. cont. Near. p. 1348).

The statement of Pollux (viii. 125), that the Ephetæ became despised, is not confirmed by the language of Dêmostenês.

³ Plutarch, Solon, c. 19; Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 2.

⁴ Read on this subject the maxims laid down by Plato, about theft (Legg. xii. p. 941). Nevertheless Plato copies, to a great degree, the arrangements of the ephetic tribunals, in his provisions for homicide (Legg. ix. p. 865–873).

issues, of homicide under particular circumstances, which he assigned to each, were adapted in Athenian belief, to the new sacred localities chosen,¹ each having its own distinct ceremonial and procedure appointed by the gods themselves. That the religious feelings of the Greeks were associated in the most intimate manner with particular localities, has already been often remarked; and Drako proceeded agreeably to them in his arrangements for mitigating the indiscriminate condemnation of every man found guilty of homicide, which was unavoidable so long as the Areopagus remained the only place of trial. The man who either confessed, or was proved, to have shed the blood of another, could not be acquitted or condemned to less than the full penalty (of death or perpetual exile with confiscation of property) by the judges on the hill of Arês, whatever excuse he might have to offer: but the judges at the Palladium and Delphinium might hear him, and even admit his plea, without contracting the taint of irreligion.² Drako did not directly meddle with, nor indeed ever mention, the judges sitting in Areopagus.

Local superstitions at Athens about trial of homicide.

¹ I know no place in which the special aptitude of particular localities, consecrated each to its own purpose, is so powerfully set forth, as in the speech of Camillus against the transfer of Rome to Veii (Livy, v. 52).

² It has been remarked to me that what I here state is inconsistent with the Eumenides of Æschylus, which introduce Orestes as tried at the Areopagus and acquitted, although his matricide is confessed; because the justification preferred by Apollo in his behalf, that Klytæmnestra had deserved her death by having previously slain Agamemnon, is held sufficient. I think, however, that an attentive study of that very curious drama, far from contradicting what is here said in the text, will farther illustrate and confirm it.

The cause tried represents two parties: first, the official prosecutors or avenging goddesses (the Eumenides), who claim Orestes as their victim, peremptorily, and without even listening to any excuse, the moment that the fact of his matricide is verified: next, Orestes himself, who admits the act, but pleads that he has committed it to avenge his father, under the sanction and even instigation of Apollo, who appears as his witness and champion.

Two points of view, respecting homicide, are here put in conflict: one repre-

sented by the Eumenides,—the other by Apollo, acting indirectly with the sanction of Zeus.

The divine privileges of the Eumenides are put in on one side, those of Apollo on the other: the former complain that the latter interferes with them, and meddles with proceedings which do not legitimately (227-715) belong to him; while they each hold out terrible menaces of the mischief which they will do respectively to Attica, if the verdict be given against them (710-714).

Athênê, as patroness of Attica, has to protect her territory against injury from both sides, and to avoid giving offence to either. This is really contrived, as much as it is possible to do consistent with finding any verdict at all. The votes of the Dikasts or Jurors are made to be equal, so that they at least, as Athenians, may not exasperate either of the powerful antagonists: and the acquittal of Orestes ensues, because Athênê herself has pronounced in his favour, on the ground that her sympathies are with the male sex rather than the female, and that the murder of Agamemnon counts with her for more than that of Klytæmnestra. This trial, assumed as the first ever held for blood spilt (πρώτας δίκας κρινόντες αἱματος χυτοῦ—682), terminates in a verdict of

In respect to homicide, then, the Drakonian ordinances were partly a reform of the narrowness, partly a mitigation of the rigour, of the old procedure; and these are all that have come down to us, having been preserved unchanged from the religious respect of the Athenians for antiquity on this peculiar matter. The rest of his ordinances are said to have been repealed by Solon, on account of their intolerable severity. So they doubtless appeared, to the Athenians of a later day, who had come to measure offences by a different scale; and even to Solon, who had to calm the wrath of a suffering people in actual mutiny.

That under this eupatrid oligarchy and severe legislation, the people of Attica were sufficiently miserable, we shall presently see when I recount the proceedings of Solon. But the age of demo-

acquittal pronounced by Athênê as casting vote among equal numbers of the Dikasts.

Upon this the Eumenides burst into violent expressions of complaint and menace, which Athênê does her best to appease. They complain of having been vanquished and dishonoured: she tells them that they have not been so, because the votes were equal: and that she decided herself in favour of Orestes, because he had been acting under the sanction and guarantee of Apollo, indirectly even of Zeus; to both of whom the responsibility of the act really belonged. She then earnestly entreats the Eumenides to renounce their displeasure, and to accept a domicile in Attica, together with the most signal testimonies of worship and reverence from the people. For a long time they refuse: at length they relent, and agree to become inmates along with her in Athens (*δέξομαι Παλλάδος ξυνοικίαν*, 917 — *μετοικίαν δ' ἐμὴν εἰς σέβοντες*, 1017). Athênê then conducts them, with solemn procession, to the resting-place appointed for them (*προτέραν δ' ἐμὲ χρὴ Στείχειν θαλάμους ἀποδείξουσιν*, 1001).

Now this resting-place, consecrated ever afterwards to the Eumenides, was close by, or actually upon the hill called Areopagus. (Pausan. i. 28. 6. Schol. ad Thucyd. i. 126. *ὡς (Ξεμῆς θεᾶς) μετὰ τὸν Ὀρέστην οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πλήσιον τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου ἰδρύσαντο, ἵνα πολλῆς τιμῆς τύχωσιν*.) The Areopagus is thus made over and consecrated to them: and as a consequence, the procedure against homicide, as there conducted, must be made conformable to their point of view:

peremptory condemnation of the guilty person, without admitting either excuse or justification. Athênê, in her bargain with them, engages that they shall never again be exposed to such an humiliation as they have recently undergone by the acquittal of Orestes: that they shall receive the highest measure of reverential worship. In return for this, they promise to ensure abundant blessings to the land (940-985).

Here, then, is the result of the drama of Æschylus, showing how those goddesses became consecrated on or close to the Areopagus, and therefore how their view of homicide became exclusively paramount *on that locality*.

It was not necessary, for the purpose of Æschylus, to say what provision Athênê made to instal Apollo and to deal with his view of homicide, opposed to that of the Eumenides. Apollo, in the case of Orestes, had gained the victory, and required nothing more. Yet his view and treatment of homicide, admitting of certain special justifications, is not to be altogether excluded from Athens, though it is excluded from the Areopagus. This difficulty is solved by providing the new judgement-seat at Delphinium, or the temple of Apollo Delphinium (Plutarch, Theseus, c. 12-14. K. F. Hermann, Gottesdienst. Alterthümer Griech. 60. 3), where the procedure of Apollo, in contradistinction to that of the Eumenides, is followed, and where justifiable homicide may be put in plea.

The legend of Apollo and the Delphinium thus forms the sequel and complement to that of the Eumenides and the Areopagus.

crazy had not yet begun, and the government received its first shock from the hands of an ambitious Eupatrid who aspired to the despotism. Such was the phase (as has been remarked in the preceding chapter) through which, during the century now under consideration, a large proportion of the Grecian governments passed.

Kylôn, an Athenian patrician—who superadded, to a great family position, the personal celebrity of a victory at Olympia, as runner in the double stadium—conceived ^{Attempted usurpation by Kylôn.} the design of seizing the acropolis and constituting himself despot. Whether any special event had occurred at home to stimulate this project, we do not know: but he obtained both encouragement and valuable aid from his father-in-law Theagenês of Megara, who, by means of his popularity with the people, had already subverted the Megarian oligarchy, and become despot of his native city. Previous to so hazardous an attempt, however, Kylôn consulted the Delphian oracle, and was advised by the god in reply, to take the opportunity of “the greatest festival of Zeus” for seizing the acropolis. Such expressions, in the natural interpretation put upon them by every Greek, designated the Olympic games in Peloponnesus. To Kylôn, moreover, himself an Olympic victor, that interpretation came recommended by an apparent peculiar propriety. But Thucydîdês, not indifferent to the credit of the oracle, reminds his readers that no question was asked nor any express direction given, *where* the intended “greatest festival of Zeus” was to be sought—whether in Attica or elsewhere—and that the public festival of the Diasia, celebrated periodically and solemnly in the neighbourhood of Athens, was also denominated the “greatest festival of Zeus Meilichius.” Probably no such exegetical scruples presented themselves to any one, until after the miserable failure of the conspiracy; least of all to Kylôn himself, who, at the recurrence of the next ensuing Olympic games, put himself at the head of a force, partly furnished by Theagenês, partly composed of his friends at home, and took sudden possession of the sacred rock of Athens. But the attempt excited general indignation among the Athenian people, who crowded in from the country to assist the archons and the prytanes of the Naukrari in putting it down. Kylôn and his companions were blockaded in the Acropolis, where they soon found themselves in straits for want of water and provisions; and though many of the Athenians went back to their homes, a sufficient besieging force was left to reduce the conspirators to the last extremity. After Kylôn himself

had escaped by stealth, and several of his companions had died of hunger, the remainder, renouncing all hope of defence, sat down as suppliants at the altar. The archon Megaklês, on regaining the citadel, found these suppliants on the point of expiring with hunger on the sacred ground, and to prevent such a pollution, engaged them to quit the spot by a promise of sparing their lives.

His failure, and massacre of his partisans by order of the Alkmæonids. No sooner however had they been removed into profane ground, than the promise was violated and they were put to death: some even, who, seeing the fate with which they were menaced, contrived to throw themselves upon the altar of the Venerable goddesses (or Eumenides) near the Areopagus, received their death wounds in spite of that inviolable protection.¹

Though the conspiracy was thus put down, and the government upheld, these deplorable incidents left behind them a long train of calamity—profound religious remorse mingled with exasperated political antipathies. There still remained, if not a considerable Kylonian party, at least a large body of persons who resented the way in which the Kylonians had been put to death, and who became in consequence bitter enemies of Megaklês the archon, and of the great family of the Alkmæonidæ, to which he belonged. Not only Megaklês himself and his personal assistants were denounced as smitten with a curse, but the taint was supposed to be transmitted to his descendants, and we shall hereafter find the wound re-opened, not only in the second and third generation, but also two centuries after the original event.² When we see that the impression left by the proceeding was so very serious, even after the length of time which had elapsed, we may well believe that it was sufficient, immediately afterwards, to poison altogether the tranquillity of the state. The Alkmæonids and their partisans long defied their opponents, resisting any public trial. The dissensions continued without hope of termination, until Solon, then enjoying a lofty reputation for sagacity and patriotism, as well as for bravery, persuaded them to submit to judicial cognizance,—at a moment so far distant from the event, that several of the actors were dead. They were accordingly tried before a special judicature of 300 Eupatrids, Myrôn of the deme Phlyeis being their accuser. In defending themselves against the charge that they had sinned against the reverence due to the gods and the consecrated right of asylum, they alleged that the

Trial and condemnation of the Alkmæonids.

¹ The narrative is given in Thucyd. i. | ² Aristophan. Equit. 445, and the
126; Herod. v. 71; Plutarch, Solon, 12. | Scholia; Herodot. v. 70.

Kylonian suppliants, when persuaded to quit the holy ground, had tied a cord round the statue of the goddess and clung to it for protection in their march; but on approaching the altar of the Eumenides, the cord accidentally broke—and this critical event (so the accused persons argued) proved that the goddess had herself withdrawn from them her protecting hand and abandoned them to their fate.¹ Their argument, remarkable as an illustration of the feelings of the time, was not however accepted as an excuse. They were found guilty, and while such of them as were alive retired into banishment, those who had already died were disinterred and cast beyond the borders. Yet their exile, continuing as it did only for a time, was not held sufficient to expiate the impiety for which they had been condemned. The Alkmæonids, one of the most powerful families in Attica, long continued to be looked upon as a tainted race,² and in cases of public calamity were liable to be singled out as having by their sacrilege drawn down the judgement of the gods upon their countrymen.³

The banishment of the guilty parties was not found sufficient to restore tranquillity. Not only did pestilential disorders prevail, but the religious susceptibilities and apprehensions of the Athenian community also remained deplorably excited. They were oppressed with sorrow and despondency, saw phantoms and heard supernatural menaces, and felt the curse of the gods upon them without abatement.⁴ In particular, it appears that the minds of the women (whose religious impulses were recognised generally by the ancient legislators as requiring watchful control) were thus disturbed and frantic. The sacrifices offered at Athens did not succeed in dissipating the epidemic, nor could the prophets at home, though they recognised that special purifications were required, discover what were the new ceremonies capable of appeasing the divine wrath. The Delphian oracle directed them to invite a higher spiritual influence from abroad, and this pro-

Pestilence
and suffering
at Athens.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, c. 12. If the story of the breaking of the cord had been true, Thucydides could hardly have failed to notice it; but there is no reason to doubt that it was the real defence urged by the Alkmæonids.

When Ephesus was besieged by Croesus, the inhabitants sought protection to their town by dedicating it to Artemis: they carried a cord from the walls of the town to the shrine of the goddess, which was situated without the walls (Herod. i. 26). The Samian despot Polykratês, when he consecrated to

the Delian Apollo the neighbouring island of Rhêneia, connected it with the island of Delos by means of a chain (Thucyd. iii. 104).

These analogies illustrate the powerful effect of visible or material continuity on the Grecian imagination.

² Herodot. i. 61.

³ See Thucyd. v. 16, and his language respecting Pleistoanax of Sparta.

⁴ Plutarch, Solon, c. 12. *Καὶ φόβοι τινες ἐκ δεισιδαιμονίας ἤμα καὶ φάσματα κατέϊχε τὴν πόλιν, &c.*

duced the memorable visit of the Kretan prophet and sage Epimenidês to Athens.

The century between 620 and 500 B.C. appears to have been remarkable for the first diffusion and potent influence of distinct religious brotherhoods, mystic rites, and expiatory ceremonies, none of which (as I have remarked in a former chapter) find any recognition in the Homeric epic. To this age belong Thalêtas, Aristéas, Abaris, Pythagoras, Onomakritus, and the earliest proveable agency of the Orphic sect.¹

Of the class of men here noticed, Epimenidês, a native of Phæstus or Knossus in Krete,² was one of the most celebrated—and the old legendary connexion between Athens and Krete, which shows itself in the tales of Theseus and Minos, is here again manifested in the recourse which the Athenians had to this island to supply their spiritual need. Epimenidês seems to have been connected with the worship of the Kretan Zeus, in whose favour he stood so high as to receive the denomination of the new Kurête³ (the Kurêtes having been the primitive ministers and organizers of that worship). He was said to be the son of the nymph Baltê; to be supplied by the nymphs with constant food, since he was never seen to eat; to have fallen asleep in his youth in a cave, and to have continued in this state without interruption for fifty-seven years; though some asserted that he remained all this time a wanderer in the mountains, collecting and studying medicinal botany in the vocation of an Iatromantis, or Leech and Prophet combined. Such narratives mark the idea entertained by antiquity of Epimenidês the Purifier,⁴ who was now called in to heal both the epidemic and the mental affliction prevalent among the Athenian people, in the same manner as his countryman and contemporary Thalêtas had been, a few years before, invited to Sparta to appease a pestilence by the effect of his music and religious hymns.⁵ The favour

¹ Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, ii. p. 313; Hoëckh, *Kreta*, iii. 2. p. 252.

² The statements respecting Epimenidês are collected and discussed in the treatise of Heinrich, *Epimenides aus Kreta*. Leipsic, 1801.

³ Diogen. Laërt. i. 114, 115.

⁴ Plutarch, *Solon*, c. 12; Diogen. Laërt. i. 109–115; Pliny, *H. N.* vii. 52. *θεοφιλῆς καὶ σοφὸς περὶ τὰ θεῖα τὴν ἐνθουσιαστικὴν καὶ τελεστικὴν σοφίαν*, &c. Maxim. Tyrius, xxxviii. 3. *θεῖος τὰ θεῖα, οὐ μαθὼν ἀλλ' ὕπνον αὐτῷ διηγείτο μακρὸν καὶ ὕναιον διδάσκαλον*.

⁵ *Ἰατρομαντῖς*, *Æschyl. Supplic.* 277;

Καθαρῆς, Iamblichus, *Vit. Pythagor.* c. 28.

Plutarch (*Sept. Sapiens. Conviv.* p. 157) treats Epimenidês simply as having lived up to the precepts of the Orphic life, or vegetable diet: to this circumstance, I presume, Plato (*Legg.* iii. p. 677) must be understood to refer, though it is not very clear. See the Fragment of the lost *Krêtes* of Euripides, p. 98, ed. Dindorf.

Karmanor of Tarrha in Krete had purified Apollo himself for the slaughter of Pytho (*Pausan.* ii. 30, 3).

⁵ Plutarch, *De Musicâ*, p. 1134–1146; *Pausanias*, i. 14, 3.

of Epimenidês with the gods, his knowledge of propitiatory ceremonies, and his power of working upon the religious feeling, was completely successful in restoring both health and mental tranquillity at Athens. He is said to have turned out some black and white sheep on the Areopagus, directing attendants to follow and watch them, and to erect new altars to the appropriate local deities on the spots where the animals lay down.¹ He founded new chapels and established various lustral ceremonies; and more especially he regulated the worship paid by the women in such manner as to calm the violent impulses which had before agitated them. We know hardly anything of the details of his proceeding, but the general fact of his visit, and the salutary effects produced in removing the religious despondency which oppressed the Athenians, are well attested. Consoling assurances and new ritual precepts, from the lips of a person supposed to stand high in the favour of Zeus, were the remedy which this unhappy disorder required. Moreover, Epimenidês had the prudence to associate himself with Solon, and while he thus doubtless obtained much valuable advice, he assisted indirectly in exalting the reputation of Solon himself, whose career of constitutional reform was now fast approaching. He remained long enough at Athens to restore completely a more comfortable tone of religious feeling, and then departed, carrying with him universal gratitude and admiration, but refusing all other reward, except a branch from the sacred olive tree in the acropolis.² His life is said to have been prolonged to the unusual period of 154 years, according to a statement which was current during the time of his younger contemporary Xenophanês of Kolophon.³ The Kretans even ventured to affirm that he lived 300 years. They extolled him not merely as a sage and a spiritual purifier,

Epimenidês
visits and
purifies
Athens.

His life and
character.

¹ Cicero (Legg. ii. 11) states that Epimenidês directed a temple to be erected at Athens to "Ῥβρις and 'Αραιδεία (Violence and Impudence): Clemens said that he had erected altars to the same two goddesses (Protrepticon, p. 22): Theophrastus said that there were altars at Athens (without mentioning Epimenidês) to these same (ap. Zenobium, Proverb. Cent. iv. 36). Ister spoke of a ἱερὸν 'Αραιδείας at Athens (Istri Fragm. ed. Siebelis, p. 62). I question whether this story has any other foundation than the fact stated by Pausanias, that the stones which were placed before the tribunal of

Areopagus, for the accuser and the accused to stand upon, were called by these names—"Ῥβρεως, that of the accused; 'Αραιδείας, that of the accuser (i. 28, 5). The confusion between stones and altars is not difficult to be understood. The other story told by Neanthes of Kyzikus respecting Epimenidês, that he had offered two young men as human sacrifices, was distinctly pronounced to be untrue by Polemo: and it reads completely like a romance (Athenæus, xiii. p. 602).

² Plutarch, Præcept. Reipubl. Gerend. c. 27, p. 820.

³ Diogen. Laërt. l. c.

but also as a poet—very long compositions on religious and mythical subjects being ascribed to him; according to some accounts, they even worshipped him as a god. Both Plato and Cicero considered Epimenidês in the same light in which he was regarded by his contemporaries, as a prophet divinely inspired, and foretelling the future under fits of temporary ecstacy. But according to Aristotle, Epimenidês himself professed to have received from the gods no higher gift than that of divining the unknown phænomena of the past.¹

The religious mission of Epimenidês to Athens, and its efficacious as well as healing influence on the public mind, deserve notice as characteristics of the age in which they occurred.² If we transport ourselves two centuries forward to the Peloponnesian war, when rational influences and positive habits of thought had acquired a durable hold upon the superior minds, and when practical discussions on political and judicial matters were familiar to every Athenian citizen, no such uncontrollable religious misery could well have subdued the entire public; while, if it had, no living man could have drawn to himself such universal veneration as to be capable of effecting a cure. Plato,³ admitting the real healing influence of rites and ceremonies, fully believed in Epimenidês as an inspired prophet during the past; but towards those who preferred claims to supernatural power in his own day, he was not so easy of faith. He, as well as Euripidês and Theophrastus, treated with indifference, and even with contempt, the Orpheotelestæ of the later times, who advertised themselves as possessing the same patent knowledge of ceremonial rites, and the same means of guiding the will of the gods, as Epimenidês had wielded before them. These Orpheotelestæ unquestionably numbered a considerable tribe of believers, and speculated with great effect, as well as with profit to themselves, upon the timorous consciences of rich men.⁴ But they enjoyed no respect with the general public, or with those to whose authority the public habitually looked up. Degenerate as they were, however, they were the legitimate representatives of the prophet and purifier from

Contrast of
his age with
that of Plato.

¹ Plato, Legg. i. p. 642; Cicero, De Divinat. i. 18; Aristot. Rhet. iii. 17.

Plato places Epimenidês ten years before the Persian invasion of Greece, whereas his real date is near upon 600 B.C.—a remarkable example of carelessness as to chronology.

² Respecting the characteristics of this age, see the second chapter of the treatise of Heinrich above alluded to, Kreta und Griechenland in Hinsicht auf Wunderglauben.

³ Plato, Kratylos, p. 405; Phædr. p. 244.

⁴ Eurip. Hippolyt. 957; Plato, Republ. ii. p. 364; Theophrast. Charact. c. 16.

Knossus, to whose presence the Athenians had been so much indebted two centuries before: and their altered position was owing less to any falling off in themselves, than to an improvement in the mass upon whom they sought to operate. Had Epimenidês himself come to Athens in those days, his visits would probably have been as much inoperative to all public purposes as a repetition of the stratagem of Phylê, clothed and equipped as the goddess Athênê, which had succeeded so completely in the days of Peisistratus—a stratagem which even Herodotus treats as incredibly absurd, although a century before his time, both the city of Athens and the Demes of Attica had obeyed, as a divine mandate, the orders of this magnificent and stately woman to restore Peisistratus.¹

¹ Herodot. i. 60.

CHAPTER XI.

SOLONIAN LAWS AND CONSTITUTION.

WE now approach a new æra in Grecian history—the first known example of a genuine and disinterested constitutional reform, and the first foundation-stone of that great fabric, which afterwards became the type of democracy in Greece. The archonship of the eupatrid Solon dates in 594 B.C., thirty years after that of Drako, and about eighteen years after the conspiracy of Kylôn (assuming the latter event to be correctly placed B.C. 612).

The lives of Solon by Plutarch and by Diogenês (especially the former) are our principal sources of information respecting this remarkable man, and while we thank them for what they have told us, it is impossible to avoid expressing disappointment that they have not told us more. For Plutarch certainly had before him both the original poems, and the original laws, of Solon, and the few transcripts, which he gives from one or the other, form the principal charm of his biography. But such valuable materials ought to have been made available to a more instructive result than that which he has brought out. There is hardly anything more to be deplored, amidst the lost treasures of the Grecian mind, than the poems of Solon; for we see by the remaining fragments, that they contained notices of the public and social phænomena before him, which he was compelled attentively to study—blended with the touching expression of his own personal feelings, in the post alike honourable and difficult, to which the confidence of his countrymen had exalted him.

Solon, son of Exekestidês, was a Eupatrid of middling fortune,¹ but of the purest heroic blood, belonging to the gens or family of the Kodrids and Neleids, and tracing his origin to the god Poseidon. His father is said to have diminished his substance by prodigality, which compelled Solon in his earlier years to have recourse to trade, and in this pursuit he visited many parts of Greece and Asia. He was thus enabled to enlarge the sphere of his observation, and to provide material for thought as well as for

Life, character and poems of Solon.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, i. ; Diogen. Laërt. iii. 1; Aristot. Polit. iv. 9, 10.

composition. His poetical talents displayed themselves at a very early age, first on light, afterwards on serious, subjects. It will be recollected that there was at that time no Greek prose writing, and that the acquisitions as well as the effusions of an intellectual man, even in their simplest form, adjusted themselves not to the limitations of the period and the semicolon, but to those of the hexameter and pentameter. Nor in point of fact do the verses of Solon aspire to any higher effect than we are accustomed to associate with an earnest, touching, and admonitory prose composition. The advice and appeals which he frequently addressed to his countrymen¹ were delivered in this easy metre, doubtless far less difficult than the elaborate prose of subsequent writers or speakers, such as Thucydidês, Isokratês, or Dêmosthenês. His poetry and his reputation became known throughout many parts of Greece, so that he was classed along with Thalês of Milêtus, Bias of Priênê, Pittakus of Mitylênê, Periander of Corinth, Kleobulus of Lindus, Cheilôn of Lacedæmon—altogether forming the constellation afterwards renowned as the seven wise men.

The first particular event in respect to which Solon appears as an active politician, is the possession of the island of Sa-
lamiis, then disputed between Megara and Athens. Me-
gara was at that time able to contest with Athens, and
for some time to contest with success, the occupation of this important island—a remarkable fact, which perhaps may be explained by supposing that the inhabitants of Athens and its neighbourhood carried on the struggle with only partial aid from the rest of Attica. However this may be, it appears that the Megarians had actually established themselves in Salamis, at the time when Solon began his political career, and that the Athenians had experienced so much loss in the struggle, as to have formally prohibited any citizen from ever submitting a proposition for its reconquest. Stung with this dishonourable abnegation, Solon counterfeited a state of ecstatic excitement, rushed into the agora, and there on the stone usually occupied by the official herald, pronounced to the surrounding crowd a short elegiac poem² which he had previously composed on the subject of Salamis. Enforcing upon them the disgrace of abandoning the island, he wrought so power-

War between
Athens and
Megara about
Salamis.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, v.

² Plutarch, Solon, viii. It was a poem of 100 lines, *χαριέντως πάνυ πεποιημένων*.

Diogenês tells us that "Solon read the verses to the people through the

medium of the herald"—a statement not less deficient in taste than in accuracy, and which spoils the whole effect of the vigorous exordium, *Αὐτὸς κήρυξ ἤλθοι ἀφ' ἱμερτῆς Σαλαμῖνος, &c.*

fully upon their feelings, that they rescinded the prohibitory law :— “ Rather (he exclaimed) would I forfeit my native city and become a citizen of Pholegandrus, than be still named an Athenian, branded with the shame of surrendered Salamis!” The Athenians again entered into the war, and conferred upon him the command of it—partly, as we are told, at the instigation of Peisistratus, though the latter must have been at this time (600-594 B.C.) a very young man, or rather a boy.¹

The stories in Plutarch, as to the way in which Salamis was recovered, are contradictory as well as apocryphal, ascribing to Solon various stratagems to deceive the Megarian occupiers. Unfortunately no authority is given for any of them. According to that which seems the most plausible, he was directed by the Delphian god first to propitiate the local heroes of the island; and he accordingly crossed over to it by night, for the purpose of sacrificing to the heroes Periphêmus and Kychreus on the Salaminian shore. Five hundred Athenian volunteers were then levied for the attack of the island, under the stipulation that if they were victorious they should hold it in property and citizenship.² They were safely landed on an outlying promontory, while Solon, having been fortunate enough to seize a ship which the Megarians had sent to watch the proceedings, manned it with Athenians and sailed straight towards the city of Salamis, to which the 500 Athenians who had landed also directed their march. The Megarians marched out from the city to repel the latter, and during the heat of the engagement, Solon, with his Megarian ship and Athenian crew, sailed directly to the city. The Megarians, interpreting this as the return of their own crew, permitted the ship to approach without resistance, and the city was thus taken by surprise. Permission having been given to the Megarians to quit the island, Solon took possession of it for the Athe-

¹ Plutarch, *l. c.*; Diogen. Laërt. i. 47. Both Herodotus (i. 59) and some authors read by Plutarch ascribed to Peisistratus an active part in the war against the Megarians, and even the capture of Nisæa the port of Megara. Now the first usurpation of Peisistratus was in 560 B.C., and we can hardly believe that he can have been prominent and renowned in a war no less than forty years before.

It will be seen hereafter (see the note on the interview between Solon and Kroesus towards the end of this chapter) that Herodotus, and perhaps other au-

thors also, conceived the Solonian legislation to date at a period later than it really does; instead of 594 B.C., they placed it nearer to the usurpation of Peisistratus.

² Plutarch, Solon, *κυρίους εἶναι τοῦ πολιτεύματος*. The strict meaning of these words refers only to the *government* of the island; but it seems almost certainly implied that they would be established in it as Klêruchs or proprietors of land, not meaning necessarily that *all* the pre-existing proprietors would be expelled.

nians, erecting a temple to Enyalios, the god of war, on Cape Skiradium, near the city of Salamis.¹

The citizens of Megara, however, made various efforts for the recovery of so valuable a possession, so that a war ensued long as well as disastrous to both parties. At last it was agreed between them to refer the dispute to the arbitration of Sparta, and five Spartans were appointed to decide it—Kritolaidas, Amompharetus, Hypsêchidas, Anaxilas and Kleomenês. The verdict in favour of Athens was founded on evidence which it is somewhat curious to trace. Both parties attempted to show that the dead bodies buried in the island conformed to their own peculiar mode of interment, and both parties are said to have cited verses from the catalogue of the *Iliad*²—each accusing the other of error or interpolation. But the Athenians had the advantage on two points; first, there were oracles from Delphi, wherein Salamis was mentioned with the epithet Ionian; next Philæus and Eurysakês, sons of the Telamonian Ajax, the great hero of the island, had accepted the citizenship of Athens, made over Salamis to the Athenians, and transferred their own residences to Braurôn and Melitê in Attica, where the deme or gens Philaidæ still worshipped Philæus as its eponymous ancestor. Such a title was held sufficient, and Salamis was adjudged by the five Spartans to Attica,³ with which it ever afterwards remained incorporated until the days of Macedonian supremacy. Two centuries and a half later, when the orator Æschinês argued the Athenian right to Amphipolis against Philip of Macedon, the legendary elements of the title were indeed put forward, but more in the way of preface or introduction to the substantial political grounds.⁴ But in the year 600 B.C., the au-

Settlement
of the dis-
pute by
Spartan
arbitration
in favour of
Athens.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 8, 9, 10. Daimachus of Platea, however, denied to Solon any personal share in the Salaminian war (Plutarch, comp. Solon and Public, c. 4).

Polyænus (i. 20) ascribes a different stratagem to Solon: compare Ælian, V. H. vii. 19. It is hardly necessary to say that the account which the Megarians gave of the way in which they lost the island was totally different: they imputed it to the treachery of some exiles (Pausan. i. 40, 4): compare Justin, ii. 7.

² Aristot. Rhet. i. 16, 3.

³ Plutarch, Solon, 10; compare Aristot. Rhet. i. 16. Alkibiadês traced up

his γένος to Eurysakês (Plutarch, Alkibiad. c. 1); Miltiadês traced up his to Philæus (Herodot. vi. 35).

According to the statement of Hêreas the Megarian, both his countrymen and the Athenians had the same way of interment: both interred the dead with their faces towards the west. This statement therefore affords no proof of any peculiarity of Athenian custom in burial.

The Eurysakeium, or precinct sacred to the hero Eurysakês, stood in the deme of Melitê (Harpokrat. ad v.), which formed a portion of the city of Athens.

⁴ Æschin. Fals. Legat. p. 250, c. 14.

thority of the legend was more deep-seated and operative, and adequate by itself to determine a favourable verdict.

In addition to the conquest of Salamis, Solon increased his reputation by espousing the cause of the Delphian temple against the extortionate proceedings of the inhabitants of Kirrha, of which more will be said in a coming chapter ; and the favour of the oracle was probably not without its effect in procuring for him that encouraging prophecy with which his legislative career opened.

It is on the occasion of Solon's legislation that we obtain our first glimpse—unfortunately but a glimpse—of the actual state of Attica and its inhabitants. It is a sad and repulsive picture, presenting to us political discord and private suffering combined.

State of Athens immediately before the legislation of Solon.

Violent dissensions prevailed among the inhabitants of Attica, who were separated into three factions—the Pedieis, or men of the plain, comprising Athens, Eleusis, and the neighbouring territory, among whom the greatest number of rich families were included ; the mountaineers in the east and north of Attica, called *Diakrii*, who were on the whole the poorest party ; and the *Paralii* in the southern portion of Attica from sea to sea, whose means and social position were intermediate between the two.¹ Upon what particular points these intestine disputes turned we are not distinctly informed. They were not however peculiar to the period immediately preceding the archontate of Solon. They had prevailed before, and they reappear afterwards prior to the despotism of Peisistratus ; the latter standing forward as the leader of the *Diakrii*, and as champion, real or pretended, of the poorer population.

But in the time of Solon these intestine quarrels were aggravated by something much more difficult to deal with—a general mutiny of the poorer population against the rich, resulting from misery combined with oppression. The *Thêtes*, whose condition we have already contemplated in the poems of Homer and Hesiod, are now presented to us as forming the bulk of the population of Attica—the cultivating tenants, metayers, and small proprietors of the country. They are exhibited as weighed down by debts and dependence, and driven in large numbers out of a state of freedom into slavery—the whole mass of them (we are told) being in debt to the rich, who were proprietors of the greater

¹ Plutarch, Solon, c. 13. The language of Plutarch, in which he talks of the Pedieis as representing the oligarchical tendency, and the *Diakrii* as representing the democratical, is not

quite accurate when applied to the days of Solon. Democratical pretensions, as such, can hardly be said to have then existed.

part of the soil.¹ They had either borrowed money for their own necessities, or they tilled the lands of the rich as dependent tenants, paying a stipulated portion of the produce, and in this capacity they were largely in arrear.

All the calamitous effects were here seen of the old harsh law of debtor and creditor—once prevalent in Greece, Italy, Asia, and a large portion of the world—combined with the recognition of slavery as a legitimate status, and of the right of one man to sell himself as well as that of another man to buy him. Every debtor unable to fulfil his contract was liable to be adjudged as the slave of his creditor, until he could find means either of paying it or working it out; and not only he himself, but his minor sons and unmarried daughters and sisters also, whom the law gave him the power of selling.² The poor man thus borrowed upon the security of his body (to translate literally the Greek phrase) and upon that of the persons in his family. So severely had these oppressive contracts been enforced, that many debtors had been reduced from freedom to slavery in Attica itself,—many others had been sold for exportation,—and some had only hitherto preserved their own freedom by selling their children. Moreover a great number of the smaller properties in Attica were under mortgage, signified (according to the formality usual in the Attic law, and continued down throughout the historical times) by a stone pillar erected on the land, inscribed with the name of the lender and the amount of the loan. The proprietors of these mortgaged lands, in case of an unfavourable turn of events, had no other prospect except that of irremediable slavery for themselves and their

Slavery of
the debtors
—law of
debtor and
creditor.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 13. "Ἀπας μὲν γὰρ ὁ δῆμος ἦν ὑπόχρεως τῶν πλουσίων· ἡ γὰρ ἐγεώργουν ἐκείνοις ἕκτα τῶν γινόμενων τελούντες, ἐκτημόριοι προσαγορεύμενοι καὶ θῆτες· ἡ χρέα λαμβάνοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν, ἀγῶγμοι τοῖς δανείουσιν ἦσαν· οἱ μὲν αὐτοῦ δουλεύοντες, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ ξένῃ πιπρασκόμενοι. Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ παῖδας ἰδίους ἡναγκάζοντο πωλεῖν, καὶ τὴν πόλιν φεύγειν διὰ τὴν χαλεπότητα τῶν δανειστῶν. Οἱ δὲ πλείστοι καὶ ῥωμαλεώτατοι συνίσταντο καὶ παρεκάλουν ἀλλήλους μὴ περιεῖν, &c.

Respecting these Hektētori, "tenants paying one-sixth portion," we find little or no information; they are just noticed in Hesychius (ν. 'Εκτῆμοροι, 'Επίμορτος) and in Pollux, vii. 151; from whom we learn that ἐπίμορτος γῆ was an expression which occurred in one of the Solonian laws. Whether they paid to the landlord one-sixth, or retained

for themselves only one-sixth, has been doubted (see Photius, Πελδάται).

Dionysius Hal. (A. R. ii. 9) compares the Thêtes in Attica to the Roman clients: that both agreed in being relations of personal and proprietary dependence is certain; but we can hardly carry the comparison farther, nor is there any evidence in Attica of that sanctity of obligation which is said to have bound the Roman patron to his client.

² So the Frisii, when unable to pay the tribute imposed by the Roman empire, "primo boves ipsos, mox agros, postremo corpora conjugum et liberorum, servitio tradebant" (Tacit. Annal. iv. 72). About the selling of children by parents, to pay the taxes, in the later times of the Roman empire, see Zosimus, ii. 38; Libanius, t. ii. p. 427, ed. Paris 1627.

families, either in their own native country robbed of all its delights, or in some barbarian region where the Attic accent would never meet their ears. Some had fled the country to escape legal adjudication of their persons, and earned a miserable subsistence in foreign parts by degrading occupations. Upon several, too, this deplorable lot had fallen by unjust condemnation and corrupt judges; the conduct of the rich, in regard to money sacred and profane, in regard to matters public as well as private, being thoroughly unprincipled and rapacious.

The manifold and long-continued suffering of the poor under this system, plunged into a state of debasement not more tolerable than that of the Gallic plebs¹—and the injustices of the rich in whom all political power was then vested—are facts well attested by the poems of Solon himself, even in the short fragments preserved to us.² It appears that immediately preceding the time of his archonship, the evils had ripened to such a point—and the determination of the mass of sufferers, to extort for themselves some mode of relief, had become so pronounced—that the existing laws could no longer be enforced. According to the profound remark of Aristotle—that seditions are generated by great causes but out of small incidents³—we may conceive that some recent events had occurred as immediate stimulants to the outbreak of the debtors, —like those which lend so striking an interest to the early Roman annals, as the inflaming sparks of violent popular movements for which the train had long before been laid. Condemnations by the archons, of insolvent debtors, may have been unusually numerous; or the maltreatment of some particular debtor, once a respected freeman, in his condition of slavery, may have been brought to act vividly upon the public sympathies—like the case of the old plebeian centurion at Rome⁴ (first impoverished by the plunder of the enemy,

¹ Caesar. Bell. Gall. vi. 13.

² See the Fragment *περὶ τῆς Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας*, No. 2, Schneidewin.

Ἀήμον θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἔτοιμος

Ἵβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἀλγέα πολλὰ παθεῖν.

.....Οὐθ' ἱερῶν κτεάνων οὔτε τι δημοσίων
Φειδόμενοι, κλέπτουσιν ἐφ' ἀρπαγῇ ἄλλοθεν
ἄλλος,

Οὐδὲ φυλάσσονται σεμνὰ δίκης θέμεθλα.

.....Ταῦτα μὲν ἐν δῆμῳ στρέφεται κακὰ τῶν δὲ
πενυχρῶν

Ἰκνεῦνται πολλοὶ γαῖαν ἐς ἄλλοδαπὴν
Πραθέντες, δεσμοῖσι τ' ἀεκελίοισι δεθέντες.

³ Aristot. Polit. *γίγνονται δὲ αἱ στάσεις οὐ περὶ μικρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ μικρῶν.*

⁴ Livy, ii. 23; Dionys. Hal. A. R. vi. 26: compare Livy, vi. 34–36.

“An placeret, fœnore circumventam

plebem, potius quam sorte creditum solvat, corpus in nervum ac supplicia dare? et gregatim quotidie de foro addictos duci, et repleti vinctis nobiles domos? et ubicunque patricius habitat, ibi carcerem privatum esse?”

The exposition of Niebuhr respecting the old Roman law of debtor and creditor (Röm. Gesch. i. p. 602 seq.; Arnold's Roman Hist., ch. viii. vol. i. p. 135), and the explanation which he there gives of the Nexi as distinguished from the Addicti, have been shown to be incorrect by M. von Savigny, in an excellent Dissertation *Über das Alt-Römische Schuldrecht* (Abhandlungen Berlin Academ. 1833, p. 70–73), an abstract of which will be found in an appendix at the close of this chapter.

then reduced to borrow, and lastly adjudged to his creditor as an insolvent), who claimed the protection of the people in the forum, rousing their feelings to the highest pitch by the marks of the slave-whip visible on his person. Some such incidents had probably happened, though we have no historians to recount them. Moreover it is not unreasonable to imagine, that that public mental affliction which the purifier Epimenidês had been invoked to appease, as it sprung in part from pestilence, so it had its cause partly in years of sterility, which must of course have aggravated the distress of the small cultivators. However this may be, such was the condition of things in 594 B.C., through mutiny of the poor freemen and Thêtes, and uneasiness of the middling citizens, that the governing oligarchy, unable either to enforce their private debts or to maintain their political power, were obliged to invoke the well-known wisdom and integrity of Solon. Though his vigorous protest (which doubtless rendered him acceptable to the mass of the people) against the iniquity of the existing system, had already been proclaimed in his poems—they still hoped that he would serve as an auxiliary to help them over their difficulties. They therefore chose him, nominally as archon along with Philombrotus, but with power in substance dictatorial.

General
mutiny and
necessity for
a large re-
form.

It had happened in several Grecian states, that the governing oligarchies, either by quarrels among their own members or by the general bad condition of the people under their government, were deprived of that hold upon the public mind which was essential to their power. Sometimes (as in the case of Pittakus of Mitylênê anterior to the archonship of Solon, and often in the factions of the Italian republics in the middle ages) the collision of opposing forces had rendered society intolerable, and driven all parties to acquiesce in the choice of some reforming dictator. Usually, however, in the early Greek oligarchies, this ultimate crisis was anticipated by some ambitious individual, who availed himself of the public discontent to overthrow the oligarchy and usurp the powers of a despot. And so probably it might have happened in Athens, had not the recent failure of Kylôn, with all its miserable consequences, operated as a deterring motive. It is curious to read, in the words of Solon himself, the temper in which his appointment was construed by a large portion of the community, but most especially by his own friends: bearing in mind that at this early day, so far as our knowledge goes, democratical government was a thing unknown in

Solon made
archon, and
invested with
full powers
of legisla-
tion.

He refuses
to make him-
self despot.

Greece—all Grecian governments were either oligarchical or despotic, the mass of the freemen having not yet tasted of constitutional privilege. His own friends and supporters were the first to urge him, while redressing the prevalent discontents, to multiply partisans for himself personally, and seize the supreme power. They even “chid him as a madman, for declining to haul up the net when the fish were already enmeshed.”¹ The mass of the people, in despair with their lot, would gladly have seconded him in such an attempt; while many even among the oligarchy might have acquiesced in his personal government, from the mere apprehension of something worse if they resisted it. That Solon might easily have made himself despot, admits of little doubt. And though the position of a Greek despot was always perilous, he would have had greater facility for maintaining himself in it than Peisistratus possessed after him; so that nothing but the combination of prudence and virtue, which marks his lofty character, restricted him within the trust specially confided to him. To the surprise of every one, —to the dissatisfaction of his own friends,—under the complaints alike (as he says) of various extreme and dissentient parties, who required him to adopt measures fatal to the peace of society²—he set himself honestly to solve the very difficult and critical problem submitted to him.

Of all grievances the most urgent was the condition of the poorer class of debtors. To their relief Solon’s first measure, the memorable *Seisachtheia*, or shaking off of burthens, was directed. The relief which it afforded was complete and immediate. It cancelled at once all those contracts in which the debtor had borrowed on the security either of his person or of his land: it forbad all future loans or contracts in which the person of the debtor was pledged as security: it deprived the creditor in future of all power to imprison, or enslave, or extort work from, his debtor, and confined him to an effective judgement at law authorizing the seizure of the property of the latter. It swept off all the numerous mortgage pillars from the landed properties in Attica, leaving the land free from all past claims. It liberated and restored to

His *Seisachtheia*, or relief-law for the poorer debtors.

¹ See Plutarch, Solon, 14; and above all, the Trochaic tetrameters of Solon himself, addressed to Phōkus, Fr. 24-26, Schneidewin:—

Οὐκ ἔφην Σόλων βαθύφρων, οὐδὲ βουλήεις ἀνὴρ,
Ἐσθλὰ γὰρ θεοῦ δίδοντος, αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐδέξατο.
Περιβαλὼν δ’ ἄγραν, ἀγασθεὺς οὐκ ἀνέσπασεν μέγα
Δίκτυον, θυμοῦ θ’ ἁμαρτῇ καὶ φρενῶν ἀπο-
σφαλεῖς.

² Aristides, *Περὶ τοῦ Παραφθέγματος*, ii. p. 397; and *Fragm.* 29, Schn. of the Iambics of Solon:—

..... εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον
Ἄ τοῖς ἐναντίοισιν ἦνδανεν τότε,
Ἀδθὺς δ’ ἂ τοῖσιν ἀτέροις δρᾶσαι . . .
Πολλῶν ἂν ἀνδρῶν ἦδ’ ἐχηρώθη πόλις.

their full rights all debtors actually in slavery under previous legal adjudication; and it even provided the means (we do not know how) of re-purchasing in foreign lands, and bringing back to a renewed life of liberty in Attica, many insolvents who had been sold for exportation.¹ And while Solon forbid every Athenian to pledge or sell his own person into slavery, he took a step farther in the same direction by forbidding him to pledge or sell his son, his daughter, or an unmarried sister under his tutelage—excepting only the case in which either of the latter might be detected in unchastity.² Whether this last ordinance was contemporaneous with the Seisachtheia, or followed as one of his subsequent reforms, seems doubtful.

By this extensive measure the poor debtors—the Thêtes, small tenants, and proprietors—together with their families, were rescued from suffering and peril. But these were not the only debtors in the state: the creditors and landlords of the exonerated Thêtes were doubtless in their turn debtors to others, and were less able to discharge their obligations in consequence of the loss inflicted upon them by the Seisachtheia. It was to assist these wealthier debtors, whose bodies were in no danger—yet without exonerating them entirely—that Solon resorted to the additional expedient of debasing the money standard. He lowered

Debasing of
the money-
standard.

¹ See the valuable fragment of his Iambics, preserved by Plutarch and Aristides, the expression of which is rendered more emphatic by the appeal to the *personal Earth*, as having passed by his measures from slavery into freedom (compare Plato, Legg. v. p. 740-741):—

Συμμαρτυροῖε ταῦτ' ἂν ἐν δίκῃ Κρόνου
Μήτηρ, μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων,
Ἄριστα, Γῆ μέλαινα, τῆς ἐγὼ ποτε
Ὀρους ἀνεῖλον πολλὰ καὶ πεπηγότας,
Πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα, νῦν ἐλευθέρα.
Πολλοὺς δ' Ἀθήνας, πατρίδ' εἰς θεόκτιτον,
Ἀνήγαγον πρᾶντας, ἄλλον ἐκδίκως,
Ἄλλον δίκαιως τοὺς δ' ἀναγκαίης ὑπο
Χρησμὸν λέγοντας, γλῶσσαν οὐκ' Ἀττικῇν
Ἰέντας, ὡς ἂν πολλὰ καὶ πλανωμένων
Τοὺς δ' ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ δουλίην ἀεικέα
ἔχοντας, ἧδ' ἐσπότας τρομευμένων,
Ἐλευθέρους ἔθηκα.

also Plutarch, Solon, c. 15.

² Plutarch, Solon, c. 23: compare c. 13. The statement in Sextus Empiricus (Pyrrhon. Hypot. iii. 24, 211) that Solon enacted a law permitting fathers to kill (φονεῖν) their children, cannot be true, and must be copied from some

untrustworthy authority: compare Dionys. Hal. A. R. ii. 26, where Dionysius contrasts the prodigious extent of the *patria potestas* among the early Romans, with the restrictions which all the Greek legislators alike—Solon, Pittakus, Charondas—either found or introduced: he says however that the Athenian father was permitted to disinherit legitimate male children, which does not seem to be correct.

Meier (Der Attische Prozess, iii. 2. p. 427) rejects the above-mentioned statement of Sextus Empiricus, and farther contends that the exposure of new-born infants was not only rare, but discountenanced as well by law as by opinion; the evidence in the Latin comedies to the contrary, he considers as manifestations of Roman, and not of Athenian, manners. In this latter opinion I do not think that he is borne out, and I agree in the statement of Schömann (Ant. J. P. Græc. sec. 82), that the practice and feeling of Athens as well as of Greece generally, left it to the discretion of the father whether he would consent, or refuse, to bring up a new-born child.

the standard of the drachma in a proportion something more than 25 per cent., so that 100 drachmas of the new standard contained no more silver than 73 of the old, or 100 of the old were equivalent to 138 of the new. By this change the creditors of these more substantial debtors were obliged to submit to a loss, while the debtors acquired an exemption, to the extent of about 27 per cent.¹

Lastly, Solon decreed that all those who had been condemned by the archons to *atimy* (civil disfranchisement) should be restored to their full privileges of citizens—excepting however from this indulgence those who had been condemned by the Ephetæ, or by the Areopagus, or by the Phylo-Basileis (the four kings of the tribes), after trial in the Prytaneium, on charges either of murder or treason.² So wholesale a measure of amnesty affords strong grounds for believing that the previous judgments of the archons had been intolerably harsh; and it is to be recollected that the Draconian ordinances were then in force.

Such were the measures of relief with which Solon met the dangerous discontent then prevalent. That the wealthy men and leaders of the people—whose insolence and iniquity he has himself severely denounced in his poems, and whose views in nominating him he had greatly disappointed³—should have detested propositions which robbed them without compensation of many legal rights, it is easy to imagine. But the statement of Plutarch, that the poor emancipated debtors were also dissatisfied, from having expected that Solon would not only remit their debts, but also redivide the soil of Attica, seems utterly incredible; nor is it confirmed by any passage now remaining of the Solonian poems.⁴ Plutarch conceives the poor debtors as having in their minds the comparison with Lykurgus and the equality of property at Sparta, which (as I have already endeavoured to show)⁵ is a fiction; and even had it been true as matter of history long past and antiquated, would not have been likely to work upon the minds of the multitude of Attica

¹ Plutarch, Solon, c. 15. See the full exposition given of this debasement of the coinage in Boeckh's *Metrologie*, ch. ix. p. 115.

M. Boeckh thinks (ch. xv. s. 2) that Solon not only debased the coin, but also altered the weights and measures. I dissent from his opinion on this latter point, and have given my reasons for so doing in a review of his valuable treatise in the *Classical Museum*, No. 1.

² Plutarch, Solon, c. 19. In the general restoration of exiles throughout

the Greek cities, proclaimed first by order of Alexander the Great, afterwards by Polysperchon, exception is made of men exiled for sacrilege or homicide (Diodor. xvii. 109; xviii. 8-46).

³ Plutarch, Solon, c. 15. οὐδὲ μαλακῶς, οὐδ' ὑπέικων τοῖς δυναμένοις, οὐδὲ πρὸς ἡδονὴν τῶν ἐλομένων, ἔθετο τοὺς νόμους, &c.

⁴ Plutarch, Solon, c. 16.

⁵ See above, part ii. ch. vi.

in the forcible way that the biographer supposes. The Seisachtheia must have exasperated the feelings and diminished the fortunes of many persons; but it gave to the large body of Thêtes and small proprietors all that they could possibly have hoped. We are told that after a short interval it became eminently acceptable in the general public mind, and procured for Solon a great increase of popularity—all ranks concurring in a common sacrifice of thanksgiving and harmony.¹ One incident there was which occasioned an outcry of indignation. Three rich friends of Solon, all men of great family in the state, and bearing names which will hereafter reappear in this history as borne by their descendants—Konôn, Kleinias and Hipponikus—having obtained from Solon some previous hint of his designs, profited by it, first, to borrow money, and next, to make purchases of lands; and this selfish breach of confidence would have disgraced Solon himself, had it not been found that he was personally a great loser, having lent money to the extent of five talents.²

General popularity of the measure after partial dissatisfaction.

In regard to the whole measure of the Seisachtheia, indeed, though the poems of Solon were open to every one, ancient authors gave different statements both of its purport and of its extent. Most of them construed it as having cancelled indiscriminately all money contracts; while Androtion and others thought that it did nothing more than lower the rate of interest and depreciate the currency to the extent of 27 per cent., leaving the letter of the contracts unchanged. How Androtion came to maintain such an opinion we cannot easily understand. For the fragments now remaining from Solon seem distinctly to refute it, though, on the other hand, they do not go so far as to substantiate the full extent of the opposite view entertained by many writers,—that all money contracts indiscriminately were rescinded:³ against which there is also a farther reason, that if the

Different statements afterwards as to the nature and extent of the Seisachtheia.

¹ Plutarch, *l. c.* *ἐθυσαν τε κοινῇ, Σεισάχθειαν τὴν θυσίαν ὀνομάζοντες, &c.*

² The anecdote is noticed, but without specification of the names of the friends, in Plutarch, *Reipub. Gerend. Præcep.* p. 807.

³ Plutarch, *Solon*, c. 15. The statement of Dionysius of Halic. in regard to the bearing of the Seisachtheia is in the main accurate—*χρεῶν ἄφεσιν ψηφισαμένην τοῖς ἀπὸροις* (v. 65)—to the debtors who were liable on the security of their bodies and their lands, and who were chiefly poor—not to *all* debtors.

Herakleïdēs Pontic. (*Πολιτ.* c. 1) and

Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* xxxi. p. 331) express themselves loosely.

Both Wachsmuth (*Hell. Alterth.* v. i. p. 259) and K. F. Hermann (*Gr. Staats Alter.* s. 106) quote the Heliastic oath and its energetic protest against repudiation, as evidence of the bearing of the Solonian Seisachtheia. But that oath is referable only to a later period; it cannot be produced in proof of any matter applicable to the time of Solon; the mere mention of the senate of Five Hundred in it, shows that it belongs to times subsequent to the Kleisthenean revolution. Nor does the passage from

fact had been so, Solon could have had no motive to debase the money standard. Such debasement supposes that there must have been *some* debtors at least whose contracts remained valid, and whom nevertheless he desired partially to assist. His poems distinctly mention three things:—1. The removal of the mortgage-pillars. 2. The enfranchisement of the land. 3. The protection, liberation, and restoration, of the persons of endangered or enslaved debtors. All these expressions point distinctly to the Thêtes and small proprietors, whose sufferings and peril were the most urgent, and whose case required a remedy immediate as well as complete. We find that his repudiation of debts was carried far enough to exonerate them, but no farther.

It seems to have been the respect entertained for the character of Solon which partly occasioned these various misconceptions of his ordinances for the relief of debtors. Andro-
 tion in ancient, and some eminent critics in modern times,
 are anxious to make out that he gave relief without loss
 or injustice to any one. But this opinion seems inadmis-
 sible. The loss to creditors by the wholesale abrogation of nume-
 rous pre-existing contracts, and by the partial depreciation of the
 coin, is a fact not to be disguised. The Seisachtheia of Solon,
 unjust so far as it rescinded previous agreements, but highly salu-
 tary in its consequences, is to be vindicated by showing that in no
 other way could the bonds of government have been held together,
 or the misery of the multitude alleviated. We are to consider,
 first, the great personal cruelty of these pre-existing contracts, which
 condemned the body of the free debtor and his family to slavery;
 next, the profound detestation created by such a system in the large
 mass of the poor, against both the judges and the creditors by whom
 it had been enforced, which rendered their feelings unmanageable,
 so soon as they came together under the sentiment of a common
 danger and with the determination to ensure to each other mutual
 protection. Moreover, the law which vests a creditor with power
 over the person of his debtor, so as to convert him into a slave, is
 likely to give rise to a class of loans which inspire nothing but ab-

Plato (Legg. iii. p. 684) apply to the case.

Both Wachsmuth and Hermann appear to me to narrow too much the extent of Solon's measure in reference to the clearing of debtors. But on the other hand, they enlarge the effect of his measures in another way, without any sufficient evidence—they think that

he raised the *villain tenants* into *free proprietors*. Of this I see no proof, and think it improbable. A large proportion of the small debtors whom Solon exonerated were probably free proprietors before; the existence of the *ὑποί* or mortgage pillars upon their land proves this.

horrence—money lent with the foreknowledge that the borrower will be unable to repay it, but also in the conviction that the value of his person as a slave will make good the loss ; thus reducing him to a condition of extreme misery, for the purpose sometimes of aggrandizing, sometimes of enriching, the lender. Now the foundation on which the respect for contracts rests, under a good law of debtor and creditor, is the very reverse of this. It rests on the firm conviction that such contracts are advantageous to both parties as a class, and that to break up the confidence essential to their existence would produce extensive mischief throughout all society. The man whose reverence for the obligation of a contract is now the most profound, would have entertained a very different sentiment if he had witnessed the dealings of lender and borrower at Athens under the old ante-Solonian law. The oligarchy had tried their best to enforce this law of debtor and creditor with its disastrous series of contracts ; and the only reason why they consented to invoke the aid of Solon, was because they had lost the power of enforcing it any longer, in consequence of the newly awakened courage and combination of the people. That which they could not do for themselves, Solon could not have done for them, even had he been willing. Nor had he in his position the means either of exempting or compensating those creditors who, separately taken, were open to no reproach ; indeed, in following his proceedings, we see plainly that he thought compensation due, not to the creditors, but to the past sufferings of the enslaved debtors, since he redeemed several of them from foreign captivity, and brought them back to their home. It is certain that no measure, simply and exclusively prospective, would have sufficed for the emergency. There was an absolute necessity for overruling all that class of pre-existing rights which had produced so violent a social fever. While, therefore, to this extent, the Seisachtheia cannot be acquitted of injustice, we may confidently affirm that the injustice inflicted was an indispensable price paid for the maintenance of the peace of society, and for the final abrogation of a disastrous system as regarded insolvents.¹ And the feeling as well as the legislation universal in the

¹ That which Solon did for the Athenian people in regard to debts, is less than what was *promised* to the Roman plebs (at the time of its secession to the Mons Sacer in 491 B.C.) by Menenius Agrippa, the envoy of the senate, to appease them, though it does not seem to have been ever *realized* (Dionys. Halic. vi. 83). He promised an abrogation of all the debts of debtors unable to

pay, without exception—if the language of Dionysius is to be trusted, which probably it cannot be.

Dr. Thirlwall justly observes respecting Solon, “He must be considered as an arbitrator to whom all the parties interested submitted their claims, with the avowed intent that they should be decided by him, not upon the footing of legal right, but according to his own

modern European world, by interdicting beforehand all contracts for selling a man's person or that of his children into slavery, goes far to sanction practically the Solonian repudiation.

One thing is never to be forgotten in regard to this measure, combined with the concurrent amendments introduced by Solon in the law—it settled finally the question to which it referred. Never again do we hear of the law of debtor and creditor as disturbing Athenian tranquillity. The general sentiment which grew up at Athens, under the Solonian money-law and under the democratical government, was one of high respect for the sanctity of contracts. Not only was there never any demand in the Athenian democracy for new tables or a depreciation of the money standard, but a formal abnegation of any such projects was inserted in the solemn oath taken annually by the numerous Dikasts, who formed the popular judicial body called *Hēliæa* or the *Hēliastic* jurors—the same oath which pledged them to uphold the democratical constitution, also bound them to repudiate all proposals either for an abrogation of debts or for a redivision of the lands.¹ There can be little doubt that under the Solonian law, which enabled the creditor to seize the property of his debtor, but gave him no power over the person, the system of money-lending assumed a more beneficial character. The old noxious contracts, mere snares for the liberty of a poor freeman

view of the public interest. It was in this light that he himself regarded his office, and he appears to have discharged it faithfully and discreetly." (History of Greece, ch. xi. vol. ii. p. 42.)

¹ Dēmosthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 746. οὐδὲ τῶν χρεῶν τῶν ἰδίῳ ἀποκοπὰς, οὐδὲ γῆς ἀναδασμὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίων, οὐδ' οἰκιῶν (ψηφισθῆναι); compare Dio Chrysostom, Orat. xxxi. p. 332, who also dwells upon the anxiety of various Grecian cities to fix a curse upon all propositions for χρεῶν ἀποκοπή and γῆς ἀναδασμός. What is not less remarkable is, that Dio seems not to be aware of any one well-authenticated case in Grecian history in which a redivision of lands had ever actually taken place—ὃ μὴδ' ἔλας ἴσμεν εἰ ποτε συνέβη. (l. c.)

For the law of debtor and creditor as it stood during the times of the Orators at Athens, see Heraldus, Animadv. ad Salmasium, p. 174–286; Meier und Schömann, Der Attische Prozess, b. iii. c. 2. p. 497 seqq. (though I doubt the distinction which they there draw between χρεός and δανείον); Platner, Prozess und Klagen, B. ii. absch. 11. pp. 349, 361.

There was one exceptional case, in which the Attic law always continued to the creditor that power over the person of the insolvent debtor which all creditors had possessed originally—it was when the creditor had lent money for the express purpose of ransoming the debtor from captivity (Dēmosthen. cont. Nikostr. p. 1249)—analogous to the *Actio Depensi* in the old Roman law.

Any citizen who owed money to the public treasury and whose debt became overdue, was deprived for the time of all civil rights until he had cleared it off.

Diodorus (i. 79) gives us an alleged law of the Egyptian king Bocchoris releasing the persons of debtors and rendering their properties only liable, which is affirmed to have served as an example for Solon to copy. If we can trust this historian, lawgivers in other parts of Greece still retained the old severe law enslaving the debtor's person; compare a passage in Isokratēs (Orat. xiv. Plataicus, p. 305; p. 414 Bek.).

and his children, disappeared, and loans of money took their place, founded on the property and prospective earnings of the debtor, which were in the main useful to both parties, and therefore maintained their place in the moral sentiment of the public. And though Solon had found himself compelled to rescind all the mortgages on land subsisting in his time, we see money freely lent upon this same security, throughout the historical times of Athens, and the evidentiary mortgage pillars remaining ever after undisturbed.

In the sentiment of an early society, as in the old Roman law, a distinction is commonly made between the principal and the interest of a loan, though the creditors have sought to blend them indissolubly together. If the borrower cannot fulfil his promise to repay the principal, the public will regard him as having committed a wrong which he must make good by his person. But there is not the same unanimity as to his promise to pay interest: on the contrary, the very exaction of interest will be regarded by many in the same light in which the English law considers usurious interest, as tainting the whole transaction. But in the modern mind, principal, and interest within a limited rate, have so grown together, that we hardly understand how it can ever have been pronounced unworthy of an honourable citizen to lend money on interest. Yet such is the declared opinion of Aristotle and other superior men of antiquity; while at Rome, Cato the censor went so far as to denounce the practice as a heinous crime.¹ It was comprehended by them among the worst of the tricks of trade—and they held that all trade, or profit derived from interchange, was unnatural, as being made by one man at the expense of another: such pursuits therefore could not be commended, though they might be tolerated to a certain extent as a matter of necessity, but they belonged essentially to an inferior order of citizens.² What is remarkable in Greece is, that the antipathy of a very early state of society against traders and

Distinction made in an early society between the principal and the interest of a loan – interest disapproved of *in toto*.

¹ Aristot. Polit. i. 4, 23; Cato ap. Cicero. de Offic. ii. 25. Plato in his Treatise de Legg. (v. p. 742) forbids all lending on interest; indeed he forbids any private citizen to possess either gold or silver.

To illustrate the marked difference made in the early Roman law, between the claim for the principal and that for the interest, I insert in an Appendix at the end of this Chapter the explanation given by M. von Savigny of the treatment of the Nexi and Addicti—connected as it is by analogy with the Solo-

nian Seisachtheia.

² Aristot. Polit. i. 4, 23. Τῆς δὲ μεταβλητικῆς ψεγομένης δικαίως (οὐ γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἔστιν), εὐλογώτατα μισεῖται ἡ ὀβολοστατική, &c. Compare Ethic. Nikom. iv. 1.

Plutarch borrows from Aristotle the quibble derived from the word *τόκος* (the Greek expression for interest), which has given birth to the well-known dictum of Aristotle—that money being naturally barren, to extract offspring from it must necessarily be contrary to nature (see Plutarch, De Vit. ÆR. Al. p. 829).

money-lenders lasted longer among the philosophers than among the mass of the people—it harmonised more with the social *idéal* of the former, than with the practical instincts of the latter.

In a rude condition such as that of the ancient Germans described by Tacitus, loans on interest are unknown. Habitually careless of the future, the Germans were gratified both in giving and receiving presents, but without any idea that they thereby either imposed or contracted an obligation.¹ To a people in this state of feeling, a loan on interest presents the repulsive idea of making profit out of the distress of the borrower. Moreover, it is worthy of remark, that the first borrowers must have been for the most part men driven to this necessity by the pressure of want, and contracting debt as a desperate resource, without any fair prospect of ability to repay: debt and famine run together in the mind of the poet Hesiod.² The borrower is, in this unhappy state, rather a distressed man soliciting aid, than a solvent man capable of making and fulfilling a contract. If he cannot find a friend to make him a free gift in the former character, he will not, under the latter character, obtain a loan from a stranger, except by the promise of exorbitant interest,³ and by the fullest even-

¹ Tacit. Germ. 26. "Fœnus agitare et in usuras extendere, ignotum; ideoque magis servatur quam si vetitum esset." (c. 21.) "Gaudent muneribus: sed nec data imputant, nec acceptis obligantur."

² Hesiod, Opp. Di. 647, 404. Βούλῃαι χρέα τε προφυγεῖν, καὶ λιμὸν ἀτερπῆ. Some good observations on this subject are to be found in the excellent treatise of M. Turgot, written in 1763, "Mémoire sur les Prêts d'Argent":—

"Les causes qui avoient autrefois rendu odieux le prêt à intérêt, ont cessé d'agir avec tant de force . . . De toutes ces circonstances réunies, il est résulté que les emprunts faits par le pauvre pour subsister ne sont plus qu'un objet de peine sensible dans la somme totale d'emprunts: que la plus grande partie des prêts se font à l'homme riche, ou du moins à l'homme industriel, qui espère se procurer de grands profits par l'emploi de l'argent qu'il emprunte . . . Les prêteurs sur gage à gros intérêt, les seuls qui prêtent véritablement au pauvre pour ses besoins journaliers et non pour le mettre en état de gagner, ne font point le même mal que les anciens usuriers qui conduisoient par degrés à la misère et à l'esclavage les pauvres citoyens auxquels ils avoient procuré des secours funestes . . . Le cré-

ancier qui pouvait réduire son débiteur en esclavage y trouvait un profit: c'étoit un esclave qu'il acquérait: mais aujourd'hui le créancier sait qu'en privant son débiteur de la liberté, il n'y gagnera autre chose que d'être obligé de le nourrir en prison: aussi ne s'avise-t-on pas de faire contracter à un homme qui n'a rien, et qui est réduit à emprunter pour vivre, des engagements qui emportent la contrainte par corps. La seule sûreté vraiment solide contre l'homme pauvre est le gage: et l'homme pauvre s'estime heureux de trouver un secours pour le moment sans autre danger que de perdre ce gage. Aussi le peuple a-t-il plutôt de la reconnaissance pour ces petits usuriers qui le secourent dans son besoin, quoiqu'ils lui vendent assez cher ce secours." (Mémoire sur les Prêts d'Argent, in the collection of Œuvres de Turgot, by Dupont de Nemours, vol. v. sect. xxx. xxxi. pp. 326, 327, 329.)

³ "In Bengal (observes Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, b. i. ch. 9. p. 143, ed. 1812) money is frequently lent to the farmers at 40, 50, and 60 per cent., and the succeeding crop is mortgaged for the payment."

Respecting this commerce at Florence in the middle ages, M. Depping observes:—"Il semblerait que l'esprit commercial fût inné chez les Florentins:

tual power over his person which he is in a condition to grant. In process of time a new class of borrowers rise up, who demand money for temporary convenience or profit, but with full prospect of repayment—a relation of lender and borrower quite different from that of the earlier period, when it presented itself in the repulsive form of misery on the one side, set against the prospect of very large profit on the other. If the Germans of the time of Tacitus looked to the condition of the poor debtors in Gaul, reduced to servitude under a rich creditor, and swelling by hundreds the crowd of his attendants, they would not be disposed to regret their own ignorance of the practice of money-lending.¹ How much the in-

déjà aux 12^{me} et 13^{me} siècles, on les voit tenir des banques et prêter de l'argent aux princes. Ils ouvrirent partout des maisons de prêt, marchèrent de pair avec les Lombards, et, il faut le dire, ils furent souvent maudits, comme ceux-ci, par leurs débiteurs, à cause de leur rapacité. Vingt pour cent par an était le taux ordinaire des prêteurs Florentins: et il n'était pas rare qu'ils en prissent trente et quarante." Depping, *Histoire du Commerce entre le Levant et l'Europe*, vol. i. p. 235.

Boeckh (*Public Economy of Athens*, book i. ch. 22) gives from 12 to 18 per cent. per annum as the common rate of interest at Athens in the time of the orators.

The valuable Inscription (No. 1845 in his *Corpus Inscr. Pars viii.* p. 23. sect. 3) proves that at Korkyra a rate of 2 per cent. per month, or 24 per cent. per annum, might be obtained from perfectly solvent and responsible borrowers. For this is a decree of the Korkyræan government, prescribing what shall be done with a sum of money given to the state for the Dionysiac festivals—placing that money under the care of certain men of property and character, and directing them to lend it out exactly at 2 per cent. per month, *neither more nor less*, until a given sum shall be accumulated. This Inscription dates about the third or second century B.C., according to Boeckh's conjecture.

The Orchomenian Inscription, No. 1569, to which Boeckh refers in the passage above alluded to, is unfortunately defective in the words determining the rate of interest payable to Eubulus: but there is another, the Theraean Inscription (No. 2446), containing the Testament of Epiktêta, wherein the annual sum payable in lieu of a priu-

cipal sum bequeathed, is calculated at 7 per cent.; a rate which Boeckh justly regards as moderate, considered in reference to ancient Greece.

¹ Caesar, B. G. i. 4, respecting the Gallic chiefs and plebs: "Die constitutâ causâ dictionis, Orgetorix ad iudicium omnem suam familiam, ad hominum millia decem, undique cœgit: et omnes clientes, obsecratosque suos, quorum magnum numerum habebat, eodem conduxit: per eos, ne causam diceret, se eripuit." Ibid. vi. 13: "Plerique, cum aut *ære alieno*, aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuriâ potentiorum, premuntur, sese in servitutem dicant nobilibus. In hos eadem omnia sunt jura, quæ dominis in servos." The wealthy Romans cultivated their large possessions partly by the hands of adjudged debtors, in the time of Columella (i. 3, 14): "more prapotentium, qui possident fines gentium, quos . . . aut occupatos nexu civium, aut ergastulis, tenent."

According to the Teutonic codes also, drawn up several centuries subsequently to Tacitus, it seems that the insolvent debtor falls under the power of his creditor and is subject to personal fetters and chastisement (Grimm, *Deutsche Rechts Alterthümer*, p. 612-615): both he and Von Savigny assimilate it to the terrible process of personal execution and addition in the old law of Rome, against the insolvent debtor on loan. King Alfred exhorts the creditor to lenity (*Laws of King Alfred*, Thorpe, *Ancient Laws of England*, vol. i. p. 53. law 35).

A striking evidence of the alteration of the character and circumstances of debtors, between the age of Solon and that of Plutarch, is afforded by the treatise of the latter, "*De Vitando Ære*

terest of money was then regarded as an undue profit extorted from distress, is powerfully illustrated by the old Jewish law; the Jew being permitted to take interest from foreigners (whom the lawgiver did not think himself obliged to protect), but not from his own countrymen.¹ The Koran follows out this point of view consistently, and prohibits the taking of interest altogether. In most other nations, laws have been made to limit the rate of interest, and at Rome especially, the legal rate was successively lowered—though

Alieno," wherein he sets forth in the most vehement manner the miserable consequences of getting into debt. "*The poor*," he says, "*do not get into debt, for no one will lend them money* (τοῖς γὰρ ἀπόροις οὐ δανείζουσιν, ἀλλὰ βουλομένοις εὐπορίαν τινα ἑαυτοῖς κτᾶσθαι καὶ μάρτυρα δίδωσι καὶ βεβαιώτην ἔξιον, ὅτι ἔχει πιστεῦσθαι): the borrowers are men who have still some property and some security to offer, but who wish to keep up a rate of expenditure beyond what they can afford, and become utterly ruined by contracting debts." (Plut. p. 827, 830.) This shows how intimately the multiplication of poor debtors was connected with the liability of their persons to enslavement. Compare Plutarch, *De Cupidine Divitiarum*, c. 2. p. 523.

¹ Levitic. xxv. 35–36; Deuteron. xxiii. 20. This enactment seems sufficiently intelligible: yet M. Salvador (*Histoire des Institutions de Moïse*, liv. iii. ch. 6) puzzles himself much to assign to it some far-sighted commercial purpose. "Unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon *usury*, but unto a stranger thou mayst lend upon *usury*." It is of more importance to remark that the word here translated *usury* really means *any interest* for money, great or small—see the opinion of the Sanhedrim of seventy Jewish doctors, assembled at Paris in 1807, cited in M. Salvador's work, *l.c.*

The Mosaic law therefore (as between Jew and Jew, or even as between Jew and the *μέτοικος* or *resident stranger*, distinguished from the *foreigner*) went as far as the Koran in prohibiting all taking of interest. That its enactments were not much observed, we have one proof at least in the proceeding of Nehemiah at the building of the second temple—which presents so curious a parallel in many respects to the Solonian *Seisachtheia*, that I transcribe the account of it from Prideaux, *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, part i. b. 6. p. 290:—

"The burden which the people un-

derwent in the carrying on of this work, and the incessant labour which they were enforced to undergo to bring it to so speedy a conclusion, being very great, . . . care was taken to relieve them from a much greater burden, the oppression of usurers; which they then in great misery lay under, and had much greater reason to complain of. For the rich, taking advantage of the necessities of the meaner sort, had exacted heavy usury of them, making them pay the centesima for all moneys lent them, that is, 1 per cent. for every month, which amounted to 12 per cent. for the whole year; so that they were forced to mortgage their lands, and sell their children into servitude, to have wherewith to buy bread for the support of themselves and their families; which being a manifest breach of the law of God, given them by Moses (for that forbids all the race of Israel to take usury of any of their brethren), Nehemiah, on his hearing hereof, resolved forthwith to remove so great an iniquity; in order whereto he called a general assembly of all the people, where having set forth unto them the nature of the offence, how great a breach it was of the divine law, and how heavy an oppression upon their brethren, and how much it might provoke the wrath of God against them, he caused it to be enacted by the general suffrage of that whole assembly, that all should return to their brethren whatsoever had been exacted of them upon usury, and also release all the lands, vineyards, olive-yards, and houses, which had been taken of them upon mortgage on the account hereof."

The measure of Nehemiah appears thus to have been not merely a *Seisachtheia* such as that of Solon, but also a *παλιντοκία* or refunding of interest paid by the debtor in past time—analogous to the proceeding of the Megarians on emancipating themselves from their oligarchy, as recounted above, Chapter ix.

it seems, as might have been expected, that the restrictive ordinances were constantly eluded. All such restrictions have been intended for the protection of debtors; an effect which large experience proves them never to produce, unless it be called protection to render the obtaining of money on loan impracticable for the most distressed borrowers. But there was another effect which they *did* tend to produce—they softened down the primitive antipathy against the practice generally, and confined the odious name of usury to loans lent above the fixed legal rate.

In this way alone could they operate beneficially, and their tendency to counterwork the previous feeling was at that time not unimportant, coinciding as it did with other tendencies arising out of the industrial progress of society, which gradually exhibited the relation of lender and borrower in a light more reciprocally beneficial, and less repugnant to the sympathies of the bystander.¹

At Athens the more favourable point of view prevailed throughout all the historical times. The march of industry and commerce, under the mitigated law which prevailed subsequently to Solon, had been sufficient to bring it about at a very early period and to suppress all public antipathy against lenders at interest.² We may remark too, that this more equitable tone of opinion grew up spontaneously, without any legal restriction on the rate of interest,—no such restriction having ever been imposed, and the rate being expressly declared free by a law ascribed to Solon himself.³ The same may probably be said of the communities of Greece generally—at least there is no information to make us suppose the contrary. But the feeling against lending money at interest remained in the bosoms of the philosophical men long after it had ceased to form a part of the practical morality of the citizens, and long after it had ceased to be justified by the appearances of the case as at first it really had been. Plato, Aristotle, Cicero,⁴ and Plutarch, treat the practice as a branch of that commercial and money-get-

This opinion was retained by the philosophers, after it had ceased to prevail in the community generally.

¹ In every law to limit the rate of interest, it is of course implied that the law not only ought to fix, but *can* fix, the maximum rate at which money is to be lent. The tribunes at Rome followed out this proposition with perfect consistency: they passed successive laws for the reduction of the rate of interest, until at length they made it illegal to take any interest at all: "Genucium, tribunum plebis, tulisse ad populum, ne foenerari liceret." (Liv. vii. 42.) His-

tory shows that the law, though passed, was not carried into execution.

² Boeckh (Public Econ. of Athens, b. i. ch. 22. p. 128) thinks differently—in my judgment, contrary to the evidence: the passages to which he refers (especially that of Theophrastus) are not sufficient to sustain his opinion, and there are other passages which go far to contradict it.

³ Lysias cont. Theomnest. A. c. 5. p. 360.

⁴ Cicero, De Officiis, i. 42.

ting spirit which they are anxious to discourage; and one consequence of this was, that they were less disposed to contend strenuously for the inviolability of existing money-contracts. The conservative feeling on this point was stronger among the mass than among the philosophers. Plato even complains of it as inconveniently preponderant,¹ and as arresting the legislator in all comprehensive projects of reform. For the most part indeed schemes of cancelling debts and redividing lands were never thought of except by men of desperate and selfish ambition, who made them stepping-stones to despotic power. Such men were denounced alike by the practical sense of the community and by the speculative thinkers: but when we turn to the case of the Spartan king Agis III., who proposed a complete extinction of debts and an equal redivision of the landed property of the state, not with any selfish or personal views, but upon pure ideas of patriotism, well or ill understood, and for the purpose of renovating the lost ascendancy of Sparta—we find Plutarch² expressing the most unqualified admiration of this young king and his projects, and treating the opposition made to him as originating in no better feelings than meanness and cupidity. The philosophical thinkers on politics conceived (and to a great degree justly, as I shall show hereafter) that the conditions of security, in the ancient world, imposed upon the citizens generally the absolute necessity of keeping up a military spirit and willingness to brave at all times personal hardship and discomfort; so that increase of wealth, on account of the habits of self-indulgence which it commonly introduces, was regarded by them with more or less of disfavour. If in their estimation any Grecian community had become corrupt, they were willing to sanction great interference with pre-existing rights for the purpose of bringing it back nearer to their ideal standard. And the real security for the maintenance of these rights lay in

¹ Plato, Legg. iii. p. 684. ὥς ἐπιχειροῦντι δὴ νομοθέτῃ κινεῖν τῶν τοιούτων τι πᾶς ἀπαντᾷ. λέγων, μὴ κινεῖν τὰ ἀκίνητα, καὶ ἐπαρᾶται γῆς τε ἀναδασμοὺς εἰσηγούμενον καὶ χρεῶν ἀποκοπᾶς, ὥστ' εἰς ἀπορίαν καθίστασθαι πάντα ἄνδρα, &c.: compare also v. p. 736–737, where similar feelings are intimated not less emphatically.

Cicero lays down very good principles about the mischief of destroying faith in contracts; but his admonitions to this effect seem to be accompanied with an impracticable condition: the lawgiver is to take care that debts shall not be contracted to an extent hurtful to the state

—“Quamobrem ne sit æs alienum, quod reipublicæ noceat, providendum est (quod multis rationibus cavari potest): non, si fuerit, ut locupletes suum perdant, debitores lucrentur alienum,” &c. What the *multæ rationes* were, which Cicero had in his mind, I do not know. Compare his opinion about *feneratores*, Offic. i. 42; ii. 25.

² See Plutarch's Life of Agis, especially ch. 13, about the bonfire in which the κλάρια or mortgage deeds of the creditors were all burnt, in the agora of Sparta; compare also the comparison of Agis with Gracchus, c. 2.

the conservative feelings of the citizens generally, much more than in the opinions which superior minds imbibed from the philosophers.

Such conservative feelings were in the subsequent Athenian democracy peculiarly deep-rooted. The mass of the Athenian people identified inseparably the maintenance of property in all its various shapes with that of their laws and constitution. And it is a remarkable fact, that though the admiration entertained at Athens for Solon was universal, the principle of his *Seisachtheia* and of his money-depreciation was not only never imitated, but found the strongest tacit reprobation; whereas at Rome, as well as in most of the kingdoms of modern Europe, we know that one debasement of the coin succeeded another. The temptation, of thus partially eluding the pressure of financial embarrassments, proved, after one successful trial, too strong to be resisted, and brought down the coin by successive depreciations from the full pound of twelve ounces to the standard of one half ounce. It is of some importance to take notice of this fact, when we reflect how much "Grecian faith" has been degraded by the Roman writers into a byword for duplicity in pecuniary dealings.¹ The democracy of Athens (and indeed the cities of Greece generally, both oligarchies and democracies) stands far above the senate of Rome, and far above the modern kingdoms of France and England until comparatively recent times, in respect of honest dealing with the coinage.² Moreover,

Solonian *Seisachtheia* never imitated at Athens—money-standard honestly maintained afterwards.

¹ "Græcâ fide mercari." Polybius puts the Greeks greatly below the Romans in point of veracity and good faith (vi. 56); in another passage he speaks not quite so confidently (xviii. 17). Even the testimony of the Roman writers is sometimes given in favour of Attic good faith, not against it—"ut semper et in omni re, quicquid sincerâ fide gereretur, id Romani, *Atticâ fieri*, prædicarent." (Velleius Paterc. ii. 23.)

The language of Heffter (*Athenâische Gerichts Verfassung*, p. 466), especially, degrades very undeservedly the state of good faith and credit at Athens.

The whole tone and argument of the Oration of Demosthenes against Leptinês is a remarkable proof of the respect of the Athenian *Dikastery* for vested interests, even under less obvious forms than that of pecuniary possession. We may add a striking passage of Demosthenês cont. Timokrat. wherein he denounces the rescinding of past transactions (*τὰ πεπραγμένα λῦσαι*, contrasted

with prospective legislation) as an injustice peculiar to oligarchy, and repugnant to the feelings of a democracy (cont. Timokrat. c. 20. p. 724; c. 36, 747).

² A similar credit, in respect to monetary probity, may be claimed for the republic of Florence. M. Sismondi says, "Au milieu des révolutions monétaires de tous les pays voisins et tandis que la mauvaise foi des gouvernements alteroit le numéraire d'une extrémité à l'autre de l'Europe, le florin ou séquin de Florence est toujours resté le même; il est du même poids, du même titre; il porte la même empreinte que celui qui fut battu en 1252." (*Républiques Italiennes*, vol. iii. ch. 18. p. 176.)

M. Boeckh (*Public Econ. of Athens*, i. 6; iv. 19), while affirming justly and decidedly, that the Athenian republic always set a high value on maintaining the integrity of their silver money—yet thinks that the gold pieces which were coined in Olymp. 93. 2. (408 B.C.) under the archonship of Antigenês (out of the

while there occurred at Rome several political changes which brought about new tables¹ or at least a partial depreciation of contracts, no phænomenon of the same kind ever happened at Athens, during the three centuries between Solon and the end of the free working of the democracy. Doubtless there were fraudulent debtors at Athens; while the administration of private law, though not in any way conniving at their proceedings, was far too imperfect to repress them as effectually as might have been wished. But the public sentiment on the point was just and decided. It may be asserted with confidence that a loan of money at Athens was quite as secure as it ever was at any time or place of the ancient world,—in spite of the great and important superiority of Rome with respect to the accumulation of a body of authoritative legal precedent, the source of what was ultimately shaped into the Roman jurisprudence. Among the various causes of sedition or mischief in the Grecian communities,² we hear little of the pressure of private debt.

By the measures of relief above described,³ Solon had accomplished results surpassing his own best hopes. He had healed the prevailing discontents; and such was the confidence and gratitude which he had inspired, that he was now called upon to draw up a constitution and laws for the better working of the government in future. His constitutional changes were great and valuable: respecting his laws, what we hear is rather curious than important.

It has been already stated that, down to the time of Solon, the

golden ornaments in the acropolis, and at a time of public embarrassments) were debased and made to pass for more than their value. The only evidence in support of this position appears to be the passage in Aristophanês (Ran. 719–737) with the Scholia; but this very passage seems to me rather to prove the contrary. “The Athenian people (says Aristophanês) deal with their public servants as they do with their coins: they prefer the new and bad to the old and good.” If the people were so exceedingly, and even extravagantly, desirous of obtaining the new coins, this is a strong proof that they were *not* depreciated, and that no loss was incurred by giving the old coins in exchange for them. They might perhaps be carelessly executed.

¹ “Sane vetus Urbi fœnebre malum (says Tacitus, Ann. vi. 16) et seditionum discordiarumque creberrima causa,” &c.; compare Appian, Bell. Civil. Præfat.; and Montesquieu, Esprit des Loix, L.

xxii. c. 22.

The constant hopes and intrigues of debtors at Rome, to get rid of their debts by some political movement, are nowhere more forcibly brought out than in the second Catilinarian Oration of Cicero, c. 8–9: read also the striking harangue of Catiline to his fellow-conspirators (Sallust, B. Catilin. c. 20–21).

² The insolvent debtor in some of the Boeotian towns was condemned to sit publicly in the agora with a basket on his head, and then disfranchised (Nikolaus Damaskenus, Frag. p. 152, ed. Orelli).

According to Diodorus, the old severe law against the body of a debtor, long after it had been abrogated by Solon at Athens, still continued in other parts of Greece (i. 79).

³ Solon, Frag. 27, ed. Schneid.—

* Ἀ μὲν ἀέλπτα σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦνυσ', ἄλλα δ' οὐ μᾶτ' ἔρδον.

* ἔρδον.

classification received in Attica was that of the four Ionic tribes, comprising in one scale the Phratries and Gentes, and in another scale the three Trittyes and forty-eight Naukraries—while the Eupatridæ, seemingly a few specially respected gentes, and perhaps a few distinguished families in all the gentes, had in their hands all the powers of government. Solon introduced a new principle of classification—called in Greek the timocratic principle. He distributed all the citizens of the tribes, without any reference to their gentes or phratries, into four classes, according to the amount of their property, which he caused to be assessed and entered in a public schedule. Those whose annual income was equal to 500 medimni of corn (about 700 Imperial bushels) and upwards—one medimnus being considered equivalent to one drachma in money—he placed in the highest class; those who received between 300 and 500 medimni or drachms formed the second class; and those between 200 and 300, the third.¹ The fourth and most numerous class comprised all those who did not possess land yield-
His census—
four scales of
property.
 ing a produce equal to 200 medimni. The first class, called Pentakosiomedimni, were alone eligible to the archonship and to all commands: the second were called the knights or horsemen of the state, as possessing enough to enable them to keep a horse and perform military service in that capacity: the third class, called the Zeugitæ, formed the heavy-armed infantry, and were bound to serve, each with his full panoply. Each of these three classes was entered in the public schedule as possessed of a taxable capital calculated with a certain reference to his annual income, but in a proportion diminishing according to the scale of that income—and a man paid taxes to the state according to the sum for which he stood rated in the schedule; so that this direct taxation acted really like a graduated income-tax. The rateable property of the citizen belonging to the richest class (the Pentakosiomedimnus) was calculated and entered on the state-schedule at a sum of capital equal to twelve times his annual income: that of the Hippeus, Horseman or knight, at a sum equal to ten times his annual income: that of the Zeugite, at a sum equal to five times his annual income. Thus a Pentakosiomedimnus whose income was exactly

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 18-23; Pollux, viii. 130; Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 4; Aristot. Fragm. *περὶ Πολιτείων*, Fr. 51, ed. Neumann; Harpokration and Photius, v. *ἵππας*; Etymolog. Mag. *Zeugίσιον*, *Θητικόν*; the Etym. Mag. *Zeugίσιον*, and the Schol. Aristoph. Equit. 627, recognise only three classes.

He took a medimnus (of wheat or barley?) as equivalent to a drachm, and a sheep at the same value (*ib. c. 23*).

The medimnus seems equal to about $1\frac{3}{4}$ (1.4) English Imperial bushel: consequently 500 medimni = 700 English Imperial bushels, or $87\frac{1}{2}$ quarters.

500 drachms (the minimum qualification of his class), stood rated in the schedule for a taxable property of 6000 drachms or one talent, being twelve times his income—if his annual income were 1000 drachms, he would stand rated for 12,000 drachms or two talents, being the same proportion of income to rateable capital. But when we pass to the second class, Horsemen or knights, the proportion of the two is changed. The Horseman possessing an income of just 300 drachms (or 300 medimni) would stand rated for 3000 drachms, or ten times his real income, and so in the same proportion for any income above 300 and below 500. Again, in the third class, or below 300, the proportion is a second time altered—the Zeugite possessing exactly 200 drachms of income was rated upon a still lower calculation, at 1000 drachms, or a sum equal to five times his income; and all incomes of this class (between 200 and 300 drachms) would in like manner be multiplied by five in order to obtain the amount of rateable capital. Upon these respective sums of scheduled capital, all direct taxation was levied. If the state required one per cent. of direct tax, the poorest Pentakosiomedimnus would pay (upon 6000 drachms) 60 drachms; the poorest Hippeus would pay (upon 3000 drachms) 30; the poorest Zeugite would pay (upon 1000 drachms) 10 drachms. And thus this mode of assessment would operate like a *graduated* income-tax, looking at it in reference to the three different classes—but as an *equal* income-tax, looking at it in reference to the different individuals comprised in one and the same class.¹

¹ The excellent explanation of the Solonian (τίμημα) property-schedule and graduated qualification, first given by Boeckh in his Staatshaushaltung der Athener (b. iii. c. 5), has elucidated a subject which was, before him, nothing but darkness and mystery. The statement of Pollux (viii. 130), given in very loose language, had been, before Boeckh, erroneously apprehended: ἀνήλυσκον εἰς τὸ δημόσιον, does not mean the sums which the Pentakosiomedimnus, the Hippeus, or the Zeugite, *actually paid* to the state, but the sums for which each was rated, or which each was *liable* to pay if called upon: of course the state does not call for the *whole* of a man's rated property, but exacts an equal proportion of it from each.

On one point I cannot concur with Boeckh. He fixes the pecuniary qualification of the third class, or Zeugites, at 150 drachms, not at 200. All the positive testimonies (as he himself al-

lows, p. 31) agree in fixing 200, and not 150; and the inference drawn from the old law, quoted in Dēmōsthēnēs (cont. Makartat, p. 1067) is too uncertain to outweigh this concurrence of authorities.

Moreover the whole Solonian schedule becomes clearer and more symmetrical if we adhere to the statement of 200 drachms, and not 150, as the lowest scale of Zeugite income; for the scheduled capital is then, in all the three scales, a definite and exact multiple of the income returned—in the richest class it is twelve times—in the middle class, ten times—in the poorest, five times the income. But this correspondence ceases, if we adopt the supposition of Boeckh, that the lowest Zeugite income was 150 drachms; for the sum of 1000 drachms (at which the lowest Zeugite was rated in the schedule) is no exact multiple of 150 drachms. In order to evade this difficulty, Boeckh

All persons in the state whose annual income amounted to less than 200 medimni or drachms were placed in the fourth class, and they must have constituted the large majority of the community. They were not liable to any direct taxation, and perhaps were not at first even entered upon the taxable schedule, more especially as we do not know that any taxes were actually levied upon this schedule during the Solonian times. It is said that they were all called *Thêtes*, but this appellation is not well sustained, and cannot be admitted: the fourth compartment in the descending scale was indeed termed the *Thetic* census, because it contained all the *Thêtes*, and because most of its members were of that humble description; but it is not conceivable that a proprietor whose land yielded to him a clear annual return of 100, 120, 140, or 180 drachms, could ever have been designated by that name.¹

Such were the divisions in the political scale established by Solon, called by Aristotle a *Timocracy*, in which the rights, honours, functions, and liabilities of the citizens were measured out according to the assessed property of each. The highest honours of the state—that is, the places of the nine archons annually chosen, as well as those in the senate of Areopagus, into which the past archons always entered—perhaps also the posts of *Prytanes* of the *Naukrari*—were reserved for the first class: the poor *Eupatrids* became ineligible, while rich men not *Eupatrids* were admitted. Other posts of inferior distinction were filled by the second and third classes, who were moreover bound to military service, the one on

Admeasurement of political rights and franchises according to this scale—a *Timocracy*.

way both roundabout and including nice fractions: he thinks that the income of each was converted into capital by multiplying by twelve, and that in the case of the richest class, or *Pentakosiomedimni*, the whole sum so obtained was entered in the schedule—in the case of the second class, or *Hippeis*, $\frac{2}{3}$ of the sum—and in the case of the third class, or *Zeugites*, $\frac{1}{3}$ of the sum. Now this process seems to me rather complicated, and the employment of a fraction such as $\frac{2}{3}$ (both difficult and not much above the simple fraction of one-half) very improbable: moreover Boeckh's own table (p. 41) gives fractional sums in the third class, when none appear in the first or second.

Such objections, of course, would not be admissible, if there were any positive evidence to prove the point. But in this case they are in harmony

with all the positive evidence, and are amply sufficient (in my judgement) to countervail the presumption arising from the old law on which Boeckh relies.

¹ See Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, *ut supra*. Pollux gives an Inscription describing Anthemion son of Diphilus,—Θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππᾶδ' ἀμειψάμενος. The word *τελεῖν* does not necessarily mean *actual* payment, but "the being included in a class with a certain aggregate of duties and liabilities,"—equivalent to *censeri* (Boeckh, p. 36).

Plato in his treatise *De Legibus* admits a quadripartite census of citizens, according to more or less of property (Legg. v. p. 744; vi. p. 756). Compare Tittmann, *Griechische Staats Verfassungen*, p. 648, 653; K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Gr. Staats Alt.* § 108.

horseback, the other as heavy-armed soldiers on foot. Moreover, the Liturgies of the state, as they were called—unpaid functions such as the trierarchy, chorêgy, gymnasiarchy, &c., which entailed expense and trouble on the holder of them—were distributed in some way or other between the members of the three classes, though we do not know how the distribution was made in these early times. On the other hand, the members of the fourth or lowest class were disqualified from holding any individual office of dignity. They performed no liturgies, served in case of war only as light-armed or with a panoply provided by the state, and paid nothing to the direct property-tax or *Eisphora*. It would be incorrect to say that they paid *no* taxes, for indirect taxes, such as duties on imports, fell upon them in common with the rest; and we must recollect that these latter were, throughout a long period of Athenian history, in steady operation, while the direct taxes were only levied on rare occasions.

But though this fourth class, constituting the great numerical majority of the free people, were shut out from individual office, their collective importance was in another way greatly increased. They were invested with the right of choosing the annual archons, out of the class of *Pentakosiomedimni*; and what was of more importance still, the archons and the magistrates generally, after their year of office, instead of being accountable to the senate of *Areopagus*, were made formally accountable to the public assembly sitting in judgement upon their past conduct. They might be impeached and called upon to defend themselves, punished in case of misbehaviour, and debarred from the usual honour of a seat in the senate of *Areopagus*.

Had the public assembly been called upon to act alone without aid or guidance, this accountability would have proved only nominal. But Solon converted it into a reality by another new institution, which will hereafter be found of great moment in the working out of the Athenian democracy. He created the *pro-bouleutic* or *pre-considering* senate of Four Hundred.

Fourth or poorest class — exercised powers only in assembly — chose magistrates and held them to account-ability.

Pro-bouleutic, or pre-considering Senate of Four Hundred.

were,—persons of the fourth or poorest class of the census, though contributing to elect, not being themselves eligible.

But while Solon thus created the new pre-considering senate, identified with and subsidiary to the popular assembly, he manifested no jealousy of the pre-existing Areopagitic senate. On the contrary, he enlarged its powers, gave to it an ample supervision over the execution of the laws generally, and imposed upon it the censorial duty of inspecting the lives and occupations of the citizens, as well as of punishing men of idle and dissolute habits. He was himself, as past archon, a member of this ancient senate, and he is said to have contemplated that by means of the two senates, the state would be held fast, as it were with a double anchor, against all shocks and storms.¹

Senate of Areopagus—its powers enlarged.

Such are the only new political institutions (apart from the laws to be noticed presently) which there are grounds for ascribing to Solon, when we take proper care to discriminate what really belongs to Solon and his age, from the Athenian constitution as afterwards remodelled. It has been a practice common with many able expositors of Grecian affairs, and followed partly even by Dr. Thirlwall,² to connect the name of Solon with the whole political and judicial state of Athens as it stood between the age of Periklês and that of Dêmosthenês,—the regulations of the senate of five hundred, the numerous public dikasts or jurors taken by lot from the people, as well as the body annually selected for law-revision, and called Nomothets, and the prosecution (called the Graphê Paranomôn) open to be instituted against the proposer of any measure illegal, unconstitutional or dangerous. There is indeed some countenance for this confusion between Solonian and post-Solonian Athens, in the usage of the orators themselves. For Dêmosthenês and Æschinês employ the name of Solon in a very loose manner, and treat him as the author of institutions belonging evidently to a later age: for example, the

Confusion frequently seen between Solonian and post-Solonian institutions.

Loose language of the Athenian orators on this point.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 18, 19, 23; Philochorus, Frag. 60, ed. Didot. Athenæus, iv. p. 168; Valer. Maxim. ii. 6.

² Meursius, Solon, *passim*; Sigonius, De Republ. Athen. i. p. 39 (though in some passages he makes a marked distinction between the time before and after Kleisthenês, p. 28). See Wachsmuth, Hellenische Alterthumskunde, vol. i. sect. 46, 47; Tittmann, Griechische Staatsverfassungen, p. 146; Platner, Der Attische Prozess, book ii. ch. 5. p. 28—

38; Dr. Thirlwall, History of Greece, vol. ii. ch. xi. p. 46-57.

Niebuhr, in his brief allusions to the legislation of Solon, keeps duly in view the material difference between Athens as constituted by Solon, and Athens as it came to be after Kleisthenês; but he presumes a closer analogy between the Roman patricians and the Athenian Eupatridæ than we are entitled to count upon.

striking and characteristic oath of the Heliastic jurors, which Dêmosthenês¹ ascribes to Solon, proclaims itself in many ways as belonging to the age after Kleisthenês, especially by the mention of the senate of five hundred, and not of four hundred. Among the citizens who served as jurors or dikasts, Solon was venerated generally as the author of the Athenian laws. An orator therefore might well employ his name for the purpose of emphasis, without provoking any critical inquiry whether the particular institution, which he happened to be then impressing upon his audience, belonged really to Solon himself or to the subsequent periods. Many of those institutions, which Dr. Thirlwall mentions in conjunction

¹ Demosthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 746. Æschinês ascribes this oath to δ νομοθέτης (c. Ktesiphon, p. 389).
Dr. Thirlwall notices the oath as prescribed by Solon (History of Greece, vol. ii. ch. xi. p. 47).

So again Dêmosthenês and Æschinês, in the orations against Leptinês (c. 21. p. 486) and against Timokrat. p. 706, 707—compare Æschin. c. Ktesiph. p. 429—in commenting upon the formalities enjoined for repealing an existing law and enacting a new one, while ascribing the whole to Solon—say, among other things, that Solon directed the proposer “to post up his project of law before the Eponymi” (ἐκθεῖναι πρόσθεν τῶν Ἐπωνύμων): now the Eponymi were (the statues of) the heroes from whom the ten Kleisthenean tribes drew their names, and the law making mention of these statues, proclaims itself as of a date subsequent to Kleisthenês. Even the law defining the treatment of the condemned murderer who returned from exile, which both Dêmosthenês and Doxopater (ap. Walz. Collect. Rhetor. vol. ii. p. 223) call a law of Drako, is really later than Solon, as may be seen by its mention of the ἄξων (Dêmosth. cont. Aristok. p. 629).

Andokidês is not less liberal in his employment of the name of Solon (see Orat. i. De Mysteriis, p. 13), where he cites as a law of Solon, an enactment which contains the mention of the tribe Æantis and the senate of five hundred (obviously therefore subsequent to the revolution of Kleisthenês), besides other matters which prove it to have been passed even subsequent to the oligarchical revolution of the four hundred, towards the close of the Peloponnesian war. The Prytanes, the Proëdri, and the division of the year into ten portions of time, each called by the name

of a *prytany*—so interwoven with all the public proceedings of Athens—do not belong to the Solonian Athens, but to Athens as it stood after the ten tribes of Kleisthenês.

Schömann maintains emphatically, that the sworn Nomothetæ as they stood in the days of Dêmosthenês were instituted by Solon; but he admits at the same time that all the allusions of the orators to this institution include both words and matters essentially post-Solonian, so that modifications subsequent to Solon must have been introduced. This admission seems to me fatal to the cogency of his proof: see Schömann, De Comitibus, ch. vii. p. 266–268; and the same author, Antiq. J. P. Att. sect. xxxii. His opinion is shared by K. F. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griech. Staats Alterth. sect. 131; and Platner, Attischer Prozess, vol. ii. p. 38.

Meier, De Bonis Damnatorum, p. 2, remarks upon the laxity with which the orators use the name of Solon: “Oratores Solonis nomine sæpe utuntur, ubi omnino legislatorem quemquam significare volunt, etiamsi a Solone ipso lex lata non est.” Hermann Schelling, in his Dissertation de Solonis Legibus ap. Oratt. Attic. (Berlin, 1842), has collected and discussed the references to Solon and to his laws in the orators. He controverts the opinion just cited from Meier, but upon arguments no way satisfactory to me (p. 6–8); the more so as he himself admits that the dialect in which the Solonian laws appear in the citation of the orators can never have been the original dialect of Solon himself (p. 3–5), and makes also substantially the same admission as Schömann, in regard to the presence of post-Solonian matters in the supposed Solonian laws (p. 23–27).

with the name of Solon, are among the last refinements and elaborations of the democratical mind of Athens—gradually prepared, doubtless, during the interval between Kleisthenès and Periklès, but not brought into full operation until the period of the latter (460-429 B.C.). For it is hardly possible to conceive these numerous dikasteries and assemblies in regular, frequent, and long standing operation, without an assured payment to the dikasts who composed them. Now such payment first began to be made about the time of Periklès, if not by his actual proposition;¹ and Dêmosthenès had good reason for contending that if it were suspended, the judicial as well as the administrative system of Athens would at once fall to pieces.² It would be a marvel, such as nothing short of strong direct evidence would justify us in believing, that in an age when even partial democracy was yet untried, Solon should conceive the idea of such institutions; it would be a marvel still greater that the half-emancipated Thêtes and small proprietors, for whom he legislated—yet trembling under the rod of the Eupatrid archons, and utterly inexperienced in collective business—should have been found suddenly competent to fulfil these ascendent functions, such as the citizens of conquering Athens in the days of Periklès—full of the sentiment of force and actively identifying themselves with the dignity of their community—became gradually competent, and not more than competent, to exercise with effect. To suppose that Solon contemplated and provided for the periodical revision of his laws by establishing a Nomothetic jury or dikastery, such as that which we find in operation during the time of Dêmosthenès, would be at variance (in my judgement) with any reasonable estimate either of the man or of the age. Herodotus says that Solon, having exacted from the Athenians solemn oaths that *they* would not rescind any of his laws for ten years, quitted Athens for that period, in order that he might not be compelled to rescind them himself: Plutarch informs us that he gave to his laws force for a century absolute.³ Solon himself, and Drako before him, had been lawgivers evoked and empowered by the special emergency of the times: the idea of a frequent revision of laws, by a body of lot-selected dikasts, belongs to a far more advanced age, and could not well have been present to the minds

Solon never contemplated the future change or revision of his own laws.

¹ See Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens*, book ii. c. 15.

² Dêmosthen. cont. *Timokrat.* c. 26. p. 731: compare Aristophanès, *Ekklesiiazus*. 302.

³ Herodot. i. 29; Plutarch, *Solon*, c. 25. Aulus Gellius affirms that the Athenians swore under strong religious penalties to observe them for ever (ii. 12).

of either. The wooden rollers of Solon, like the tables of the Roman decemvirs,¹ were doubtless intended as a permanent “*fons omnis publici privatique juris.*”

If we examine the facts of the case, we shall see that nothing more than the bare foundation of the democracy of Athens as it stood in the time of Periklēs, can reasonably be ascribed to Solon. “I gave to the people (Solon says in one of his short remaining fragments²) as much strength as sufficed for their needs, without either enlarging or diminishing their dignity: for those too who possessed power and were noted for wealth, I took care that no unworthy treatment should be reserved. I stood with the strong shield cast over both parties, so as not to allow an unjust triumph to either.” Again, Aristotle tells us that Solon bestowed upon the people as much power as was indispensable, but no more:³ the power to elect their magistrates and hold them to accountability: if the people had had less than this, they could not have been expected to remain tranquil—they would have been in slavery and hostile to the constitution. Not less distinctly does Herodotus speak, when he describes the revolution subsequently operated by Kleisthenēs—the latter (he tells us) found “the Athenian people excluded from everything.”⁴ These passages seem positively to contradict the

¹ Livy, iii. 34.

² Solon, Fragm. ii. 3, ed. Schneidewin:—

Δῆμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον κράτος, ὅσσον ἐπαρκεῖ,

Τιμῆς οὐτ’ ἀφελὼν, οὐτ’ ἐπορεξάμενος.

Οἱ δ’ εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγγοῖ,

Καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν αἰκὲς ἔχειν.

Ἔστην δ’ ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερὸν σάκος ἀμφοτέροισι,

Νικᾶν δ’ οὐκ εἶας οὐδετέρους ἀδίκως.

The reading *ἐπαρκεῖ* in the first line is not universally approved: Brunnck adopts *ἐπαρκεῖν*, which Niebuhr approves. The latter construes it to mean—“I gave to the people only so much power as could not be withheld from them.” (Röm. Geschichte, t. ii. p. 346, 2nd ed.) Taking the first two lines together, I think Niebuhr’s meaning is substantially correct, though I give a more literal translation myself. Solon seems to be vindicating himself against the reproach of having been too democratical, which was doubtless addressed to him in every variety of language.

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 4. Ἐπεὶ Σόλων γ’ εἰκοι τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην ἀποδιδόναι τῷ δήμῳ δύναμιν, τὸ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν, μηδὲ γὰρ τούτου κύριος ἂν ὁ δῆμος, δοῦλος ἂν εἴη καὶ πολέμιος.

In this passage respecting Solon (containing sections 2, 3, 4 of the edition of M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire) Aristotle first gives the opinion of certain critics who praised Solon, with the reasons upon which it is founded; next, the opinion of certain critics who blamed him, with *their* reasons; thirdly, his own judgement. The first of these three contains sect. 2 (from Σόλωνά δ’ ἔνιοι, down to τὰ δικαστήρια ποιήσας ἐκ πάντων). The second contains the greater part of sect. 3 (from Διὸ καὶ μέμφονταί τινες αὐτῷ, down to τὴν νῦν δημοκρατίαν). The remainder is his own judgement. I notice this, because sections 2 and 3 are not to be taken as the opinion of Aristotle himself, but of those upon whom he was commenting, who considered Solon as the author of the *dikasteries* selected by lot.

⁴ Herodot. v. 69. τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον, πρότερον ὑποσωμένον πάντων, &c.

supposition, in itself sufficiently improbable, that Solon is the author of the peculiar democratical institutions of Athens, such as the constant and numerous dikasts for judicial trials and revision of laws. The genuine and forward democratical movement of Athens begins only with Kleisthenês, from the moment when that distinguished Alkmæonid, either spontaneously or from finding himself worsted in his party strife with Isagoras, purchased by large popular concessions the hearty co-operation of the multitude under very dangerous circumstances. While Solon, in his own statement as well as in that of Aristotle, gave to the people as much power as was strictly needful, but no more—Kleisthenês (to use the significant phrase of Herodotus), “being vanquished in the party contest with his rival, *took the people into partnership.*”¹ It was, thus, to the interests of the weaker section, in a strife of contending nobles, that the Athenian people owed their first admission to political ascendancy—in part, at least, to this cause, though the proceedings of Kleisthenês indicate a hearty and spontaneous popular sentiment. But such constitutional admission of the people would not have been so astonishingly fruitful in positive results, if the course of public events for the half century after Kleisthenês had not been such as to stimulate most powerfully their energy, their self-reliance, their mutual sympathies, and their ambition. I shall recount in a future chapter these historical causes, which, acting upon the Athenian character, gave such efficiency and expansion to the great democratical impulse communicated by Kleisthenês: at present it is enough to remark that that impulse commences properly with Kleisthenês, and not with Solon.

The real Athenian democracy begins with Kleisthenês.

But the Solonian constitution, though only the foundation, was yet the indispensable foundation, of the subsequent democracy. And if the discontents of the miserable Athenian population, instead of experiencing his disinterested and healing management, had fallen at once into the hands of selfish power-seekers like Kylôn or Peisistratus—the memorable expansion of the Athenian mind during the ensuing century would never have taken place, and the whole subsequent history of Greece would probably have taken a different course. Solon left the essential powers of the

¹ Herodot. v. 66–69. Οἱτοὶ οἱ ἄνδρες (Kleisthenês and Isagoras) ἐστασίασαν περὶ δυνάμεως· ἐσσούμενος δὲ ὁ Κλεισθένης τὸν δῆμον προσεταιρίζεται . . . Ὡς γὰρ δὴ τὸν Ἀθηναίων δῆμον, πρότερον ἀπωσμένον πάντων, τότε πρὸς τὴν ἐωυτοῦ μοίρην προσεθήκατο, (Klei-

sthenês) τὰς φυλὰς μετωνόμασε . . . ἦν δὲ, τὸν δῆμον προσθέμενος, πολλῶ κατῴπερθε τῶν ἀντιστασιώτεων.

As to the marked democratic tendency of the proceedings of Kleisthenês, see Aristot. Polit. vi. 2, 11; iii. 1, 10.

state still in the hands of the oligarchy. The party combats (to be recounted hereafter) between Peisistratus, Lykurgus and Megaklês, thirty years after his legislation, which ended in the despotism of Peisistratus, will appear to be of the same purely oligarchical character as they had been before Solon was appointed archon. But the oligarchy which he established was very different from the unmitigated oligarchy which he found, so teeming with oppression and so destitute of redress, as his own poems testify.

It was he who first gave both to the citizens of middling property and to the general mass, a *locus standi* against the Eupatrids. He enabled the people partially to protect themselves, and familiarised them with the idea of protecting themselves, by the peaceful exercise of a constitutional franchise. The new force, through which this protection was carried into effect, was the public assembly called *Heliæa*,¹ regularised and armed with enlarged prerogatives and farther strengthened by its indispensable ally—the pro-bouleutic or pre-considering senate. Under the Solonian constitution, this force was merely secondary and defensive, but after the renovation of Kleisthenês it became paramount and sovereign. It branched out gradually into those numerous popular dikasteries which so powerfully modified both public and private Athenian life, drew to itself the undivided reverence and submission of the people, and by degrees rendered the single magistracies essentially subordinate functions. The popular assembly, as constituted by Solon, appearing in modified efficiency and trained to the office of reviewing and judging the general conduct of a past magistrate—forms the

¹ Lysias cont. Theomnest. A. c. 5. p. 357, who gives *ἐὰν μὴ προσημύσῃ ἡ Ἥλιαία* as a Solonian phrase; though we are led to doubt whether Solon can ever have employed it, when we find Pollux (vii. 5, 22) distinctly stating that Solon used the word *ἐκλήτρια* to signify what the orators called *προσημύματα*.

The original and proper meaning of the word *Ἥλιαία* is, the public assembly (see Tittmann, Griech. Staatsverfass. p. 215-216); in subsequent times we find it signifying at Athens—1. The aggregate of 6000 dikasts chosen by lot annually and sworn, or the assembled people considered as exercising judicial functions; 2. Each of the separate fractions into which this aggregate body was in practice subdivided for actual judicial business. *Ἐκκλησία* became the term for the public deliberative assem-

bly properly so called, which could never be held on the same day that the dikasteries sat (Dêmosthen. cont. Timokrat. c. 21, p. 726): every dikastery is in fact always addressed as if it were the assembled people engaged in a specific duty.

I imagine the term *Ἥλιαία* in the time of Solon to have been used in its original meaning—the public assembly, perhaps with the implication of employment in judicial proceeding. The fixed number of 6000 does not date before the time of Kleisthenês, because it is essentially connected with the ten tribes; while the subdivision of this body of 6000 into various bodies of jurors for different courts and purposes did not commence, probably, until after the first reforms of Kleisthenês. I shall revert to this point when I touch upon the latter and his times.

intermediate stage between the passive Homeric agora, and those omnipotent assemblies and dikasteries which listened to Periklês or Dêmosthenês. Compared with these last, it has in it but a faint streak of democracy—and so it naturally appeared to Aristotle, who wrote with a practical experience of Athens in the time of the orators; but compared with the first, or with the ante-Solonian constitution of Attica, it must doubtless have appeared a concession eminently democratical. To impose upon the Eupatrid archon the necessity of being elected, or put upon his trial of after-accountability, by the *rabble* of freemen (such would be the phrase in Eupatrid society), would be a bitter humiliation to those among whom it was first introduced; for we must recollect that this was the most extensive scheme of constitutional reform yet propounded in Greece, and that despots and oligarchies shared between them at that time the whole Grecian world. As it appears that Solon, while constituting the popular assembly with its pro-bouleutic senate, had no jealousy of the senate of Areopagus, and indeed even enlarged its powers—we may infer that his grand object was, not to weaken the oligarchy generally, but to improve the administration and to repress the misconduct and irregularities of the individual archons; and that too, not by diminishing their powers, but by making some degree of popularity the condition both of their entry into office, and of their safety or honour after it.

It is, in my judgement, a mistake to suppose that Solon transferred the judicial power of the archons to a popular dikastery. These magistrates still continued self-acting judges, deciding and condemning without appeal—not mere presidents of an assembled jury, as they afterwards came to be during the next century.¹ For the general exercise

The archons still continued to be judges until after the time of Kleisthenês.

¹ The statement of Plutarch, that Solon gave an appeal from the decision of the archon to the judgement of the popular dikastery (Plutarch, Solon, 18), is distrusted by most of the expositors, though Dr. Thirlwall seems to admit it, justifying it by the analogy of the Ephetæ or judges of appeal constituted by Drako (Hist. of Greece, vol. ii. ch. xi. p. 46).

To me it appears that the Drakonian Ephetæ were not really judges in *appeal*: but be that as it may, the supposition of an appeal from the judgement of the archon is inconsistent with the known course of Attic procedure, and has apparently arisen in Plutarch's mind from confusion with the Roman *provocatio*, which really was an appeal from the

judgement of the consul to that of the people. Plutarch's comparison of Solon with Publicola leads to this suspicion—*Καὶ τοῖς φεύγουσι δίκην, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν δῆμον, ὥσπερ ὁ Σόλων τοὺς δικαστὰς, ἔδωκε* (Publicola). The Athenian archon was first a judge without appeal; and afterwards, ceasing to be a judge, he became president of a dikastery, performing only those preparatory steps which brought the case to an issue fit for decision: but he does not seem ever to have been a judge subject to appeal.

It is hardly just to Plutarch to make him responsible for the absurd remark that Solon rendered his laws intentionally obscure, in order that the dikasts might have more to do and greater power. He gives the remark, himself,

of such power they were accountable after their year of office. Such accountability was the security against abuse—a very insufficient security, yet not wholly inoperative. It will be seen however presently, that these archons, though strong to coerce, and perhaps to oppress, small and poor men—had no means of keeping down rebellious nobles of their own rank, such as Peisistratus, Lykurgus, and Megaklês, each with his armed followers. When we compare the drawn swords of these ambitious competitors, ending in the despotism of one of them, with the vehement parliamentary strife between Themistoklês and Aristeidês afterwards, peaceably decided by the vote of the sovereign people and never disturbing the public tranquillity—we shall see that the democracy of the ensuing century fulfilled the conditions of order, as well as of progress, better than the Solonian constitution.

To distinguish this Solonian constitution from the democracy which followed it, is essential to a due comprehension of the progress of the Greek mind, and especially of Athenian affairs. That democracy was achieved by gradual steps, which will be hereafter described. Dêmosthenês and Æschinês lived under it as a system consummated and in full activity, when the stages of its previous growth were no longer matter of exact memory ; and the dikasts then assembled in judgement were pleased to hear their constitution associated with the names either of Solon or of Theseus. Their inquisitive contemporary Aristotle was not thus misled : but even common-place Athenians of the century preceding would have escaped the same delusion. For during the whole course of the democratical movement from the Persian invasion down to the Peloponnesian war, and especially during the changes proposed by Periklês and Ephialtês, there was always a strenuous party of resistance, who would not suffer the people to forget that they had already forsaken, and were on the point of forsaking still more, the orbit marked out by Solon. The illustrious Periklês underwent innumerable attacks both from the orators in the assembly and from the comic writers in the theatre. And among these sarcasms on the political tendencies of the day, we are probably to number the complaint, breathed by the poet Kratinus, of the desuetude into which both Solon and Drako had fallen—“ I swear (said he in a fragment of one of his comedies)

After changes in the Athenian constitution overlooked by the orators, but understood by Aristotle, and strongly felt at Athens during the time of Periklês.

only with the saving expression λέγεται, } even by its author, whoever he may
 “ it is said ;” and we may well doubt } have been.
 whether it was ever seriously intended |

by Solon and Drako, whose wooden tablets (of laws) are now employed by people to roast their barley.”¹ The laws of Solon respecting penal offences, respecting inheritance and adoption, respecting the private relations generally, &c., remained for the most part in force: his quadripartite census also continued, at least for financial purposes, until the archonship of Nausinikus in 377 B.C.—so that Cicero and others might be warranted in affirming that his laws still prevailed at Athens: but his political and judicial arrangements had undergone a revolution² not less complete and memorable than the character and spirit of the Athenian people generally. The choice, by way of lot, of archons and other magistrates—and the distribution by lot of the general body of dikasts or jurors into pannels for judicial business—may be decidedly considered as not belonging to Solon, but adopted after the revolution of Kleisthenês;³ probably the choice of senators by lot also. The lot was a symptom of pronounced democratical spirit, such as we must not seek in the Solonian institutions.

It is not easy to make out distinctly what was the political position of the ancient Gentes and Phratries, as Solon left them. The four tribes consisted altogether of gentes and phratries, insomuch that no one could be included in any one of the tribes who was not also a member of some gens and phratry. Now the new pro-bouleutic or preconsidering senate consisted of 400 members,—100 from each of the tribes: persons not included in any gens or phratry could therefore have had no access to it. The conditions of eligibility were similar, according to ancient custom, for the nine archons—of course, also, for the senate of Areopagus. So that there remained only the public assembly, in which an Athenian not a member of these tribes could take part: yet he was a citizen, since he could give his vote for archons and senators, and

Gentes and Phratries under the Solonian constitution—status of persons not included in them.

¹ Kratinus ap. Plutarch. Solon. 25.—

Πρὸς τοῦ Σόλωνος καὶ Δράκοντος, οἷσι νῦν Φρύγουσιν ἤδη τὰς κάχυς ταῖς κύρβεσιν.

Isokratês praises the moderate democracy in early Athens, as compared with that under which he lived; but in the Orat. vii. (Areopagitic.) he connects the former with the names of Solon and Kleisthenês, while in the Orat. xii. (Panathenaic.) he considers the former to have lasted from the days of Theseus to those of Solon and Peisistratus. In this latter oration he describes pretty exactly the power which the people possessed under the Solonian constitu-

tion, — τοῦ τὰς ἀρχὰς καταστήσαι καὶ λαβεῖν δίκην παρὰ τῶν ἐξαμάρτανόντων, which coincides with the phrase of Aristotle—τὰς ἀρχὰς αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύ- νειν,—supposing ἀρχόντων to be understood as the substantive of ἐξαμάρτανόντων.

Compare Isokratês, Or. vii. p. 143 (p. 192 Bek.) and p. 150 (202 Bek.), and Orat. xii. p. 260–264 (351–356 Bek.).

² Cicero, Orat. pro Sext. Roscio, c. 25; Ælian, V. H. viii. 10.

³ This seems to be the opinion of Dr. Thirlwall, against Wachsmuth; though he speaks with doubt (History of Greece, vol. ii. ch. 11, p. 48, 2nd ed.).

could take part in the annual decision of their accountability, besides being entitled to claim redress for wrong from the archons in his own person—while the alien could only do so through the intervention of an avouching citizen or *Prostatês*. It seems therefore that all persons not included in the four tribes, whatever their grade of fortune might be, were on the same level in respect to political privilege as the fourth and poorest class of the Solonian census. It has already been remarked, that even before the time of Solon, the number of Athenians not included in the *gentes* or *phratries* was probably considerable: it tended to become greater and greater, since these bodies were close and unexpansive, while the policy of the new lawgiver tended to invite industrious settlers from other parts of Greece to Athens. Such great and increasing inequality of political privilege helps to explain the weakness of the government in repelling the aggressions of *Peisistratus*, and exhibits the importance of the revolution afterwards wrought by *Kleisthenês*, when he abolished (for all political purposes) the four old tribes, and created ten new comprehensive tribes in place of them.

In regard to the regulations of the senate and the assembly of the people, as constituted by Solon, we are altogether without information: nor is it safe to transfer to the Solonian constitution the information, comparatively ample, which we possess respecting these bodies under the later democracy.

The laws of Solon were inscribed on wooden rollers and triangular tablets, in the species of writing called *Boustrophêdon* (lines alternating first from left to right, and next from right to left, like the course of the ploughman), and preserved first in the *Akropolis*, subsequently in the *Prytaneium*. On the tablets, called *Kyrbeis*, were chiefly commemorated the laws respecting sacred rites and sacrifices:¹ on the pillars or rollers, of which there were at least sixteen, were placed the regulations respecting matters profane. So small are the fragments which have come

¹ Plutarch, *Solon*, 23-25. He particularly mentions the sixteenth *ἄξων*: we learn also that the thirteenth *ἄξων* contained the eighth law (c. 19): the twenty-first law is alluded to in *Harpokration*, v. "Ὅτι οἱ ποιητοί.

Some remnants of these wooden rollers existed in the days of Plutarch in the Athenian *Prytaneium*. See *Harpokration* and *Photius*, v. *Κύρβεις*; *Aristot.* *περὶ Πολιτειῶν*, Frag. 35, ed. *Neumann*; *Euphorion* ap. *Harpokrat.* 'Ὁ κάτωθεν

νόμος. *Bekker*, *Anecdota*, p. 413.

What we read respecting the *ἄξωνες* and the *κύρβεις* does not convey a clear idea of them. Besides *Aristotle*, both *Seleukus* and *Didymus* are named as having written commentaries expressly about them (*Plutarch*, *Solon*, i.; *Suidas*, v. 'Ὀργῶνες; compare also *Meursius*, *Solon*, c. 24; *Vit. Aristotelis* ap. *Westermann. Vitarum Scriptt. Græc.* p. 404), and the collection in *Stephan. Thesaur.* p. 1095.

down to us, and so much has been ascribed to Solon by the orators which belongs really to the subsequent times, that it is hardly possible to form any critical judgement respecting the legislation as a whole, or to discover by what general principles or purposes he was guided.

He left unchanged all the previous laws and practices respecting the crime of homicide, connected as they were intimately with the religious feelings of the people. The laws of Drako on this subject, therefore, remained, but on other subjects, according to Plutarch, they were altogether abrogated :¹ there is however room for supposing, that the repeal cannot have been so sweeping as this biographer represents.

The Solonian laws seem to have borne more or less upon all the great departments of human interest and duty. We find regulations political and religious, public and private, civil and criminal, commercial, agricultural, sumptuary, and disciplinarian. Solon provides punishment for crimes, restricts the profession and status of the citizen, prescribes detailed rules for marriage as well as for burial, for the common use of springs and wells, and for the mutual interest of conterminous farmers in planting or hedging their properties. As far as we can judge from the imperfect manner in which his laws come before us, there does not seem to have been any attempt at a systematic order or classification. Some of them are mere general and vague directions, while others again run into the extreme of speciality.

By far the most important of all was the amendment of the law of debtor and creditor which has already been adverted to, and the abolition of the power of fathers and brothers to sell their daughters and sisters into slavery. The prohibition of all contracts on the security of the body was itself sufficient to produce a vast improvement in the character and condition of the poorer population,—a result which seems to have been so sensibly obtained from the legislation of Solon, that Boeckh and some other eminent authors suppose him to have abolished villenage and conferred upon the poor tenants a property in their lands, annulling the seigniorial rights of the landlord. But this opinion rests upon no positive evidence, nor are we warranted in ascribing to him any stronger measure in reference to the land than the annulment of the previous mortgages.²

¹ Plutarch, Solon, c. 17; Cyrill. cont. Julian. v. p. 169, ed. Spanheim. The enumeration of the different admitted justifications for homicide, which we find in Dêmosth. cont. Aristokrat. p. 637, seems rather too copious and sys-

tematic for the age of Drako; it may have been amended by Solon, or perhaps in an age subsequent to Solon.

² See Boeckh, Public Economy of the Athenians, book iii. sect. 5. Tittmann (Griechisch. Staatsverfass. p. 651) and

The Drakon-
ian laws
about homi-
cide retained;
the rest abro-
gated.

Multifarious
character of
the laws of
Solon: no
appearance of
classification.

The first pillar of his laws contained a regulation respecting exportable produce. He forbade the exportation of all produce of the Attic soil, except olive-oil alone. And the sanction employed to enforce observance of this law deserves notice, as an illustration of the ideas of the time—the archon was bound on pain of forfeiting 100 drachms, to pronounce solemn curses against every offender.¹ We are probably to take this prohibition in conjunction with other objects said to have been contemplated by Solon, especially the encouragement of artisans and manufacturers at Athens. Observing (we are told) that many new immigrants were just then flocking into Attica to seek an establishment, in consequence of its greater security, he was anxious to turn them rather to manufacturing industry than to the cultivation of a soil naturally poor.² He forbade the granting of citizenship to any immigrants, except to such as had quitted irrevocably their former abodes, and come to Athens for the purpose of carrying on some industrious profession; and in order to prevent idleness, he directed the senate of Areopagus to keep watch over the lives of the citizens generally, and punish every one who had no course of regular labour to support him. If a father had not taught his son some art or profession, Solon relieved the son from all obligation to maintain him in his old age. And it was to encourage the multiplication of these artisans, that he ensured, or sought to ensure, to the residents in Attica the exclusive right of buying and consuming all its landed produce except olive-oil, which was raised in abundance more than sufficient for their wants. It was his wish that the trade with foreigners should be carried on by exporting the produce of artisan labour, instead of the produce of land.³

others have supposed (from Aristot. Polit. ii. 4, 4) that Solon enacted a law to limit the quantity of land which any individual citizen might acquire. But the passage does not seem to me to bear out such an opinion.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 24. The *first law*, however, is said to have related to the ensuring of a maintenance to wives and orphans (Harpokration, v. *Σίτρος*).

By a law of Athens (which marks itself out as belonging to the century after Solon, by the fulness of its provisions and by the number of steps and official persons named in it), the rooting up of an olive-tree in Attica was forbidden, under a penalty of 200 drachms for each tree so destroyed—except for sacred

purposes, or to the extent of two trees per annum for the convenience of the proprietor (Démosthen. cont. Makartat. c. 16. p. 1074).

² Plutarch, Solon, 22. *ταῖς τέχναις ἀξίωμα περιέθηκε.*

³ Plutarch, Solon, 22–24. According to Herodotus, Solon had enacted that the authorities should punish every man with death who could not show a regular mode of industrious life (Herod. ii. 177; Diodor. i. 77).

So severe a punishment is not credible; nor is it likely that Solon borrowed his idea from Egypt.

According to Pollux (viii. 6) idleness was punished by *atimy* (civil disfranchisement) under Drako: under Solon,

This commercial prohibition is founded on principles substantially similar to those which were acted upon in the early history of England, with reference both to corn and to wool, and in other European countries also. In so far as it was at all operative, it tended to lessen the total quantity of produce raised upon the soil of Attica, and thus to keep the price of it from rising,—a purpose less objectionable (if we assume that the legislator is to interfere at all) than that of our late Corn Laws, which were destined to prevent the price of grain from falling. But the law of Solon must have been altogether inoperative, in reference to the great articles of human subsistence; for Attica imported, both largely and constantly, grain and salt-provisions,—probably also wool and flax for the spinning and weaving of the women, and certainly timber for building. Whether the law was ever enforced with reference to figs and honey, may well be doubted; at least these productions of Attica were in after-times generally consumed and celebrated throughout Greece. Probably also in the time of Solon, the silver-mines of Laureium had hardly begun to be worked: these afterwards became highly productive, and furnished to Athens a commodity for foreign payments not less convenient than lucrative.¹

It is interesting to notice the anxiety, both of Solon and of Drako, to enforce among their fellow citizens industrious and self-maintaining habits;² and we shall find the same sentiment proclaimed by Periklēs, at the time when Athenian power was at its maximum. Nor ought we to pass over this early manifestation in Attica of an opinion equitable and tolerant towards sedentary industry, which in most other parts of Greece was regarded as comparatively dishonourable. The general tone of Grecian sentiment recognised no occupations as perfectly worthy of a free citizen except arms, agriculture, and athletic and musical exercises; and the proceedings of the Spartans, who kept aloof even from agriculture and left it to their Helots, were admired, though they could not be copied, throughout most part of the Hellenic world. Even minds like Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon concurred to a considerable extent in this feeling, which they justified on the ground that the sedentary life and unceasing house-work of the

this punishment only took effect against the person who had been convicted of it on three successive occasions. See Meursius, Solon, c. 17; and the 'Areopagus' of the same author, c. 8 and 9; and Taylor, Lectt. Lysiac, cap. 10.

¹ Xenophon, De Vectigalibus, iii. 2.

² Thucyd. ii. 40 (the funeral oration delivered by Periklēs):—καὶ τὸ πένεσθαι οὐχ ὁμολογεῖν τινα αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλ' οὐ διαφεύγειν ἔργῳ αἰσχίον.

The prohibition of little or no effect.

Encouragement to artisans and industry.

artisan were inconsistent with military aptitude. The town-occupations are usually described by a word which carries with it contemptuous ideas, and though recognised as indispensable to the existence of the city, are held suitable only for an inferior and semi-privileged order of citizens. This, the received sentiment among Greeks, as well as foreigners, found a strong and growing opposition at Athens, as I have already said—corroborated also by a similar feeling at Corinth.¹ The trade of Corinth, as well as of Chalkis in Eubœa, was extensive, at a time when that of Athens had scarce any existence. But while the despotism of Periander can hardly have failed to operate as a discouragement to industry at Corinth, the contemporaneous legislation of Solon provided for traders and artisans a new home at Athens, giving the first encouragement to that numerous town-population both in the city and in the Peiræus, which we find actually residing there in the succeeding century. The multiplication of such town residents, both citizens and metics, (*i. e.* resident persons, not citizens, but enjoying an assured position and civil rights) was a capital fact in the onward march of Athens, since it determined not merely the extension of her trade, but also the pre-eminence of her naval force—and thus, as a farther consequence, lent extraordinary vigour to her democratical government. It seems moreover to have been a departure from the primitive temper of Atticism, which tended both to cantonal residence and rural occupation. We have therefore the greater interest in noting the first mention of it as a consequence of the Solonian legislation.

To Solon is first owing the admission of a power of testamentary bequest at Athens, in all cases in which a man had no legitimate children. According to the pre-existing custom, we may rather presume that if a deceased person left neither children nor blood relations, his property descended (as at Rome) to his gens and phratry.² Throughout most rude states of society the power of willing is unknown, as among the ancient Germans—among the Romans prior to the twelve tables—in the old laws of the Hindus,³ &c. Society limits a man's in-

Power of
testamentary
bequest—
first sanc-
tioned by
Solon.

¹ Herodot. ii. 167–177; compare Xenophon, *Æconomic*, iv. 3.

The unbounded derision, however, which Aristophanês heaps upon Kleôn as a tanner, and upon Hyperbolus as a lamp-maker, proves that if any manufacturer engaged in politics, his party opponents found enough of the old sentiment remaining to turn it to good account against him.

² This seems the just meaning of the words, ἐν τῷ γένει τοῦ τεθνηκότος ἔδει τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὸν οἶκον καταμενεῖν, for that early day (Plutarch, Solon, 21): compare Meier, *De Gentilitate Atticâ*, p. 33.

³ Tacitus, *German*, c. 20; Halhed, *Preface to Gentoo Code*, p. i. iii.; Mill's *History of British India*, b. ii. ch. iv. p. 214.

terest or power of enjoyment to his life, and considers his relatives as having joint reversionary claims to his property, which take effect, in certain determinate proportions, after his death. Such a view was the more likely to prevail at Athens, since the perpetuity of the family sacred rites, in which the children and near relatives partook of right, was considered by the Athenians as a matter of public as well as of private concern. Solon gave permission to every man dying without children to bequeathe his property by will as he should think fit; and the testament was maintained unless it could be shown to have been procured by some compulsion or improper seduction. Speaking generally, this continued to be the law throughout the historical times of Athens. Sons, wherever there were sons, succeeded to the property of their father in equal shares, with the obligation of giving out their sisters in marriage along with a certain dowry. If there were no sons, then the daughters succeeded, though the father might by will, within certain limits, determine the person to whom they should be married, with their rights of succession attached to them; or might, with the consent of his daughters, make by will certain other arrangements about his property. A person who had no children or direct lineal descendants might bequeathe his property at pleasure: if he died without a will, first his father, then his brother or brother's children, next his sister or sister's children succeeded: if none such existed, then the cousins by the father's side, next the cousins by the mother's side,—the male line of descent having preference over the female. Such was the principle of the Solonian laws of succession, though the particulars are in several ways obscure and doubtful.¹ Solon, it appears, was the first who gave power of superseding by testament the rights of agnates and gentiles to succession,—a proceeding in consonance with his plan of encouraging both industrious occupation and the consequent multiplication of individual acquisitions.²

It has been already mentioned that Solon forbade the sale of daughters or sisters into slavery by fathers or brothers; a prohibition which shows how much females had before been looked upon as articles of property. And it would seem that before his time the violation of a free woman must have been

¹ See the Dissertation of Bunsen, *De Jure Hereditario Atheniensium*, pp. 28, 29; and Hermann Schelling, *De Solonis Legibus ap. Oratt. Atticos*, ch. xvii.

The adopted son was not allowed to bequeathe by will that property of which adoption had made him the possessor:

if he left no legitimate children, the heirs at law of the adopter claimed it as of right (*Dêmosten. cont. Leochar. p. 1100; cont. Stephan. B. p. 1133; Bunsen, ut sup. p. 55-58*).

² Plutarch, *Solon*, 21. τὰ χρήματα, κτήματα τῶν ἐχόντων ἐποίησεν.

punished at the discretion of the magistrates; for we are told that he was the first who enacted a penalty of 100 drachms against the offender, and twenty drachms against the seducer of a free woman.¹ Moreover it is said that he forbade a bride when given in marriage to carry with her any personal ornaments and appurtenances, except to the extent of three robes and certain matters of furniture not very valuable.² Solon farther imposed upon women several Regulations about funerals. restraints in regard to proceeding at the obsequies of deceased relatives. He forbade profuse demonstrations of sorrow, singing of composed dirges, and costly sacrifices and contributions. He limited strictly the quantity of meat and drink admissible for the funeral banquet, and prohibited nocturnal exit, except in a car and with a light. It appears that both in Greece and Rome, the feelings of duty and affection on the part of surviving relatives prompted them to ruinous expense in a funeral, as well as to unmeasured effusions both of grief and conviviality; and the general necessity experienced for legal restriction is attested by the remark of Plutarch, that similar prohibitions to those enacted by Solon were likewise in force at his native town of Chæroneia.³

¹ According to Æschinês (cont. Timarch. pp. 16-78), the punishment enacted by Solon against the *προαγωγός*, or procurer, in such cases of seduction, was death.

² Plutarch, Solon, 20. These *φερναί* were independent of the dowry of the bride, for which the husband, when he received it, commonly gave security, and repaid it in the event of his wife's death: see Bunsen, *De Jure Hered. Ath.* p. 43.

³ Plutarch, *l. c.* The Solonian restrictions on the subject of funerals were to a great degree copied in the twelve tables at Rome: see Cicero, *De Legg.* ii. 23, 24. He esteems it a right thing to put the rich and the poor on a level in respect to funeral ceremonies. Plato follows an opposite idea, and limits the expense of funerals upon a graduated scale according to the census of the deceased (*Legg.* xii. p. 959).

Dêmosthenês (cont. Makartat. p. 1071) gives what he calls the Solonian law on funerals, different from Plutarch on several points.

Ungovernable excesses of grief among the female sex are sometimes mentioned in Grecian towns: see the *μανικὸν πένθος* among the Milesian women (*Polyæn.* viii. 63): the Milesian women, however, had a tinge of Karian feeling.

Compare an instructive inscription recording a law of the Greek city of Gam-breion in Æolic Asia Minor, wherein the dress, the proceedings, and the time of allowed mourning, for men, women and children who had lost their relatives, are strictly prescribed under severe penalties (Franz, *Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte in Kleinasien*, Berlin, 1840, p. 17). Expensive ceremonies in the celebration of marriage are forbidden by some of the old Scandinavian laws (Wilda, *Das Gildenwesen im Mittelalter*, p. 18).

And we may understand the motives, whether we approve the wisdom or not, of sumptuary restrictions on these ceremonies, when we read the account given by Colonel Sleeman of the ruinous expenses incurred to this day among the Hindoos, in the celebration of marriage. (*Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official*, vol. i. ch. vi. p. 51-53.)

"I do not believe there is a country upon earth, in which a larger portion of the wealth of the community is spent in the ceremonies of marriage. . . . One of the evils which press most upon Indian society, is, the necessity which long usage has established of squandering large sums of money in marriage ceremonies. Instead of giving what they can to their children to establish them,

Other penal enactments of Solon are yet to be mentioned. He forbade absolutely evil-speaking with respect to the dead. He forbade it likewise with respect to the living, either in a temple or before judges or archons, or at any public festival—on pain of a forfeit of three drachms to the person aggrieved, and two more to the public treasury. How mild the general character of his punishments was, may be judged by this law against foul language, not less than by the law before-mentioned against rape. Both the one and the other of these offences were much more severely dealt with under the subsequent law of democratical Athens. The peremptory edict against speaking ill of a deceased person, though doubtless springing in a great degree from disinterested repugnance, is traceable also in part to that fear of the wrath of the departed which strongly possessed the early Greek mind.

About evil-speaking and abusive language.

It seems generally that Solon determined by law the outlay for the public sacrifices, though we do not know what were his particular directions. We are told that he reckoned a sheep and a medimnus (of wheat or barley?) as equivalent, either of them, to a drachm, and that he also prescribed the prices to be paid for first-rate oxen intended for solemn occasions. But it astonishes us to see the large recompense which he awarded out of the public treasury to a victor at the Olympic or Isthmian games: to the former 500 drachms, equal to one year's income of the highest of the four classes on the census; to the latter 100 drachms. The magnitude of these rewards strikes us the more when we compare them with the fines on rape and evil speaking. We cannot be surprised that the philosopher Xenophanês noticed, with some degree of severity, the extravagant estimate of this species of excellence, current among the Grecian cities.¹ At the same time, we must remember both that these Pan-Hellenic sacred games

Rewards to the victors at the sacred games.

and enable them to provide for their families, parents everywhere feel bound to squander all they have, and all they can borrow, in the festivities of marriage. . . . Every man feels himself bound to waste all his stock and capital, and exhaust all his credit, in feeding idlers during the ceremonies which attend the marriage of his children, because his ancestors squandered similar sums, and he would sink in the estimation of society if he were to allow his children to be married with less. There is nothing which husband and wife recollect through life with so much pride and pleasure as

the cost of their marriage, if it happen to be large for their condition in life; it is their Amoku, their title of nobility. Nothing is now more common than to see an individual in the humblest rank, spending all he has or can borrow, in the marriage of one out of many daughters, and trusting to Providence for the means of marrying the others."

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 23. Xenophanês, Frag. 2, ed. Schneidewin. If Diogenês is to be trusted, the rewards were even larger anterior to Solon: he reduced them (Diog. L. i. 55).

presented the chief visible evidence of peace and sympathy among the numerous communities of Greece, and that in the time of Solon, factitious reward was still needful to encourage them. In respect to land and agriculture Solon proclaimed a public reward of five drachms for every wolf brought in, and one drachm for every wolf's cub: the extent of wild land has at all times been considerable in Attica. He also provided rules respecting the use of wells between neighbours, and respecting the planting in conterminous olive-grounds. Whether any of these regulations continued in operation during the better-known period of Athenian history cannot be safely affirmed.¹

In respect to theft, we find it stated that Solon repealed the punishment of death which Drako had annexed to that
Theft. crime, and enacted as a penalty, compensation to an amount double the value of the property stolen. The simplicity of this law perhaps affords ground for presuming that it really does belong to Solon. But the law which prevailed during the time of the orators respecting theft² must have been introduced at some later period, since it enters into distinctions and mentions both places and forms of procedure, which we cannot reasonably refer to the forty-sixth Olympiad. The public dinners at the Prytaneum, of which the archons and a select few partook in common, were also either first established, or perhaps only more strictly regulated, by Solon. He ordered barley-cakes for their ordinary meals, and wheaten loaves for festival days, prescribing how often each person should dine at the table.³ The honour of dining at the table of the Prytaneum was maintained throughout as a valuable reward at the disposal of the government.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, c. 23. See Suidas, v. *Φεισόμεθα*.

² See the laws in Dêmosthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 733-736. Notwithstanding the opinion both of Heraldus (Animadversion. in Salmas. iv. 8) and of Meier (Attischer Prozess, p. 356), I cannot imagine anything more than the basis of these laws to be Solonian—they indicate a state of Attic procedure too much elaborated for that day (Lysias c. Theomn. p. 356). The word *ποδοκάκη* belongs to Solon, and probably the penalty, of five days' confinement in the stocks, for the thief who had not restored what he had stolen.

Aulus Gell. (xi. 18) mentions the simple *pœna dupli*: in the authors from whom he copied, it is evident that Solon was stated to have enacted this law

generally for *all* thefts: we cannot tell from whom he copied, but in another part of his work, he copies a Solonian law from the wooden *ἄξονες* on the authority of Aristotle (ii. 12).

Plato, in his Laws, prescribes the *pœna dupli* in all cases of theft without distinction of circumstances (Legg. ix. p. 857; xii. p. 941); it was also the primitive law of Rome: "posuerunt furem duplo condemnari, fœneratorem quadruplo." (Cato, De Re Rusticâ, Proœmium)—that is to say, in cases of *furtum nec manifestum* (Walter, Geschichte des Römisch. Rechts. sect. 757).

³ Plutarch, Solon, 24; Athenæ. iv. p. 137; Diogen. Laërt. i. 58: *καὶ πρῶτος τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν ἐννέα ἀρχόντων ἐποίησεν, εἰς τὸ συνειπεῖν*.

Among the various laws of Solon, there are few which have attracted more notice than that which pronounces the man, who in a sedition stood aloof and took part with neither side, to be dishonoured and disfranchised.¹ Strictly speaking, this seems more in the nature of an emphatic moral denunciation, or a religious curse, than a legal sanction capable of being formally applied in an individual case and after judicial trial,—though the sentence of Atîmy, under the more elaborated Attic procedure, was both definite in its penal consequences and also judicially delivered. We may however follow the course of ideas under which Solon was induced to write this sentence on his tables, and we may trace the influence of similar ideas in later Attic institutions. It is obvious that his denunciation is confined to that special case in which a sedition has already broken out: we must suppose that Kylon has seized the Akropolis, or that Peisistratus, Megaklês, and Lykurgus, are in arms at the head of their partisans. Assuming these leaders to be wealthy and powerful men, which would in all probability be the fact, the constituted authority—such as Solon saw before him in Attica, even after his own organic amendments—was not strong enough to maintain the peace; it became in fact itself one of the contending parties. Under such given circumstances, the sooner every citizen publicly declared his adherence to some one of them, the earlier this suspension of legal authority was likely to terminate. Nothing was so mischievous as the indifference of the mass, or their disposition to let the combatants fight out the matter among themselves, and then to submit to the victor.² Nothing was more likely to encourage aggression on the part of an ambitious malcontent, than the conviction, that if he could once overpower the small amount of physical force which surrounded the archons, and exhibit himself in armed possession of the Prytaneium or the Akropolis, he might immediately count upon passive submission on the part of all the freemen without. Under the state of feeling which Solon inculcates, the insurgent leader would have to calculate that every man who was not actively in his favour would be actively against him, and this would render his enterprise much more dangerous. Indeed he could then never hope to succeed, except on the double supposition of extraordinary popularity in his own person, and wide-spread detestation of the existing government. He would thus be placed under the in-

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 20, and De Serâ Numinis Vindictâ, p. 559; Aulus Gell. ii. 12.

² See a case of such indifference manifested by the people of Argos in Plutarch's Life of Aratus, c. 27.

Censure pronounced by Solon upon citizens neutral in a sedition.

fluence of powerful deterring motives ; so that mere ambition would be less likely to seduce him into a course which threatened nothing but ruin, unless under such encouragements from the pre-existing public opinion as to make his success a result desirable for the community. Among the small political societies of Greece—especially in the age of Solon, when the number of despots in other parts of Greece seems to have been at its maximum—every government, whatever might be its form, was sufficiently weak to make its overthrow a matter of comparative facility. Unless upon the supposition of a band of foreign mercenaries—which would render the government a system of naked force, and which the Athenian lawgiver would of course never contemplate—there was no other stay for it except a positive and pronounced feeling of attachment on the part of the mass of citizens. Indifference on their part would render them a prey to every daring man of wealth who chose to become a conspirator. That they should be ready to come forward, not only with voice but with arms—and that they should be known beforehand to be so—was essential to the maintenance of every good Grecian government. It was salutary, in preventing mere personal attempts at revolution ; and pacific in its tendency, even where the revolution had actually broken out—because in the greater number of cases the proportion of partisans would probably be very unequal, and the inferior party would be compelled to renounce their hopes.

Necessity,
under the
Grecian city-
governments,
of some
positive
sentiment on
the part of
the citizens.

It will be observed that in this enactment of Solon, the existing government is ranked merely as one of the contending parties. The virtuous citizen is enjoined, not to come forward in its support, but to come forward at all events, either for it or against it. Positive and early action is all which is prescribed to him as matter of duty. In the age of Solon there was no political idea or system yet current which could be assumed as an unquestionable datum—no conspicuous standard to which the citizens could be pledged under all circumstances to attach themselves. The option lay only, between a mitigated oligarchy in possession, and a despot in possibility ; a contest wherein the affections of the people could rarely be counted upon in favour of the established government. But this neutrality in respect to the constitution was at an end after the revolution of Kleisthenês, when the idea of the sovereign people and the democratical institutions became both familiar and precious to every individual citizen. We shall hereafter find the Athenians binding themselves by the most sincere and solemn oaths to uphold their

Contrast in
this respect
between the
age of Solon
and the sub-
sequent de-
mocracy.

democracy against all attempts to subvert it; we shall discover in them a sentiment not less positive and uncompromising in its direction, than energetic in its inspirations. But while we notice this very important change in their character, we shall at the same time perceive that the wise precautionary recommendation of Solon, to obviate sedition by an early declaration of the impartial public between two contending leaders, was not lost upon them. Such, in point of fact, was the purpose of that salutary and protective institution which is called the Ostracism. When two party-leaders, in the early stages of the Athenian democracy, each powerful in adherents and influence, had become passionately embarked in bitter and prolonged opposition to each other, such opposition was likely to conduct one or other to violent measures. Over and above the hopes of party triumph, each might well fear that if he himself continued within the bounds of legality, he might fall a victim to aggressive proceedings on the part of his antagonists. To ward off this formidable danger, a public vote was called for to determine which of the two should go into temporary banishment, retaining his property and unvisited by any disgrace. A number of citizens not less than 6000, voting secretly and therefore independently, were required to take part, pronouncing upon one or other of these eminent rivals a sentence of exile for ten years. The one who remained became of course more powerful, yet less in a situation to be driven into anti-constitutional courses, than he was before. I shall in a future chapter speak again of this wise precaution and vindicate it against some erroneous interpretations to which it has given rise. At present I merely notice its analogy with the previous Solonian law, and its tendency to accomplish the same purpose of terminating a fierce party-feud, by artificially calling in the votes of the mass of impartial citizens against one or other of the leaders, —with this important difference, that while Solon assumed the hostile parties to be actually in arms, the ostracism averted that grave public calamity by applying its remedy to the premonitory symptoms.

The same idea followed out in the subsequent Ostracism.

I have already considered, in a previous chapter, the directions given by Solon for the more orderly recital of the Homeric poems; and it is curious to contrast his reverence for the old epic with the unqualified repugnance which he manifested towards Thespiis and the drama—then just nascent, and holding out little promise of its subsequent excellence. Tragedy and comedy were now beginning to be grafted on the lyric and choric song. First one actor was provided to relieve the

Sentiment of Solon towards the Homeric poems and the drama.

chorus; next two actors were introduced to sustain fictitious characters and carry on a dialogue, in such manner that the songs of the chorus and the interlocution of the actors formed a continuous piece. Solon, after having heard Thespis acting (as all the early composers did, both tragic and comic) in his own comedy, asked him afterwards if he was not ashamed to pronounce such falsehoods before so large an audience. And when Thespis answered that there was no harm in saying and doing such things merely for amusement, Solon indignantly exclaimed, striking the ground with his stick,¹ "If once we come to praise and esteem such amusement as this, we shall quickly find the effects of it in our daily transactions." For the authenticity of this anecdote it would be rash to vouch, but we may at least treat it as the protest of some early philosopher against the deceptions of the drama; and it is interesting as marking the incipient struggles of that literature in which Athens afterwards attained such unrivalled excellence.

It would appear that all the laws of Solon were proclaimed, inscribed, and accepted without either discussion or resistance. He is said to have described them, not as the best laws which he could himself have imagined, but as the best which he could have induced the people to accept. He gave them validity for the space of ten years, during which period² both the senate collectively and the archons individually swore to observe them with fidelity; under penalty, in case of non-observance, of a golden statue as large as life to be erected at Delphi. But though the acceptance of the laws was accomplished without difficulty, it was not found so easy either for the people to understand and obey, or for the framer to explain them. Every day persons came to Solon either with praise, or criticism, or suggestions of various improvements, or questions as to the construction of particular enactments; until at last he became tired of this endless process of reply and vindication, which was seldom successful either in removing obscurity or in satisfying complainants. Foreseeing that if he remained he would be compelled to make changes, he obtained leave of absence from his countrymen for ten years, trusting that before the expiration of that period they would have become accustomed to his laws. He quitted his native city, in the full certainty that his laws would remain unrepealed until his return; for (says Herodotus) "the Athenians *could not* repeal them, since they were bound by solemn oaths to observe them for ten years."

Difficulties
of Solon
after the
enactment
of the laws.
He retires
from Attica.

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 29; Diogen. Laërt. i. 59.

² Plutarch, Solon, 15.

The unqualified manner in which the historian here speaks of an oath, as if it created a sort of physical necessity and shut out all possibility of a contrary result, deserves notice as illustrating Grecian sentiment.¹

On departing from Athens, Solon first visited Egypt, where he communicated largely with Psenôphis of Heliopolis and Sonchis of Saïs, Egyptian priests who had much to tell respecting their ancient history, and from whom he learnt matters real or pretended, far transcending in alleged antiquity the oldest Grecian genealogies—especially the history of the vast submerged island of Atlantis, and the war which the ancestors of the Athenians had successfully carried on against it, 9000 years before. Solon is said to have commenced an epic poem upon this subject, but he did not live to finish it, and nothing of it now remains. From Egypt he went to Cyprus, where he visited the small town of Æpeia, said to have been originally founded by Demophôn son of Theseus, and ruled at this period by the prince Philokyprus—each town in Cyprus having its own petty prince. It was situated near the river Klarius in a position precipitous and secure, but inconvenient and ill-supplied. Solon persuaded Philokyprus to quit the old site and establish a new town down in the fertile plain beneath. He himself staid and became Ækist of the new establishment, making all the regulations requisite for its safe and prosperous march, which was indeed so decisively manifested, that many new settlers flocked into the new plantation, called by Philokyprus *Soli*, in honour of Solon. To our deep regret, we are not permitted to know what these regulations were; but the general fact is attested by the poems of Solon himself, and the lines, in which he bade farewell to Philokyprus on quitting the island, are yet before us. On the dispositions of this prince his poem bestowed unqualified commendation.²

Visits Egypt and Cyprus.

Besides his visit to Egypt and Cyprus, a story was also current of his having conversed with the Lydian king Crœsus at Sardis. The communication said to have taken place between them has been woven by Herodotus into a sort of moral tale which forms one of the most beautiful episodes in his whole history. Though this tale has been told and

Alleged interview and conversation of Solon with Crœsus at Sardis.

¹ Herodot. i. 29. Σόλων, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναῖος, ὃς Ἀθηναίοισι νόμους κελεύσασι ποιήσας, ἀπεδήμησε ἕτεα δέκα, ἵνα δὴ μή τινα τῶν νόμων ἀναγκάσθῃ λῦσαι τῶν ἔθετο· αὐτοὶ γὰρ οὐκ οἶοι τε ἦσαν αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι Ἀθηναῖοι, ὀρκίοισι γὰρ μεγάλοισι κατείχοντο, δέκα ἕτεα χρῆσθαι νόμοισι τοὺς ἄν σφι

Σόλων θῆται.

One hundred years is the term stated by Plutarch (Solon, 25).

² Plutarch, Solon, 26; Herodot. v. 113. The statements of Diogenês that Solon founded Soli in Kilikia, and that he died in Cyprus, are not worthy of credit (Diog. Laërt. i. 51-62).

retold as if it were genuine history, yet as it now stands, it is irreconcilable with chronology—although very possibly Solon may at some time or other have visited Sardis, and seen Cræsus as hereditary prince.¹

¹ Plutarch tells us that several authors rejected the reality of this interview as being chronologically impossible. It is to be recollected that the question all turns upon the interview as described by Herodotus and its alleged sequel; for that there may have been an interview between Solon and Cræsus at Sardis, at some period between B.C. 594 and 560, is possible, though not shown.

It is evident that Solon made no mention of any interview with Cræsus in his poems; otherwise the dispute would have been settled at once. Now this, in a man like Solon, amounts to negative evidence of some value, for he noticed in his poems both Egypt and the prince Philokyprus in Cyprus, and had there been any conversation so impressive as that which Herodotus relates, between him and Cræsus, he could hardly have failed to mention it.

Wesseling, Larcher, Volney, and Mr. Clinton, all try to obviate the chronological difficulties, and to save the historical character of this interview, but in my judgement unsuccessfully. See Mr. Clinton's *F. H.* ad ann. 546 B.C., and Appendix, c. 17. p. 298. The chronological data are these—Cræsus was born in 595 B.C., one year before the legislation of Solon: he succeeded to his father at the age of thirty-five, in 560 B.C.: he was overthrown, and Sardis captured, in 546 B.C., by Cyrus.

Mr. Clinton, after Wesseling and the others, supposes that Cræsus was king jointly with his father Halyattês, during the lifetime of the latter, and that Solon visited Lydia and conversed with Cræsus during this joint reign in 570 B.C. "We may suppose that Solon left Athens in B.C. 575, about twenty years after his archonship, and returned thither in B.C. 565, about five years before the usurpation of Peisistratus" (p. 300). Upon which hypothesis we may remark,—

1. The arguments whereby Wesseling and Mr. Clinton endeavour to show that Cræsus was king jointly with his father, do not sustain the conclusion. The passage of Nikolaus Damaskenus, which is produced to show that it was Halyattês (and not Cræsus) who con-

quered Karia, only attests that Halyattês marched with an armed force against Karia (*ἐνὶ Κάρῳ στρατεύων*): this same author states, that Cræsus was deputed by Halyattês to govern *Adramyttium and the plain of Thêbê* (*ἐρχεῖν ἀποδεειγμένος*), but Mr. Clinton stretches this testimony to an inadmissible extent when he makes it tantamount to a conquest of *Æolis* by Halyattês ("so that *Æolis* is already conquered"). Nothing at all is said about *Æolis* or the cities of the *Æolic* Greeks in this passage of Nikolaus, which represents Cræsus as governing a sort of satrapy under his father Halyattês, just as Cyrus the younger did in after-times under Artaxerxes. And the expression of Herodotus, *ἐπεὶ τε, δόντος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκπέτησε τῆς ἀρχῆς ὁ Κροῖσος*, appears to me, when taken along with the context, to indicate a bequest or nomination of successor, and not a donation during life.

2. The hypothesis therefore that Cræsus was king 570 B.C., during the lifetime of his father, is one purely gratuitous, resorted to on account of the chronological difficulties connected with the account of Herodotus. But it is quite insufficient for such a purpose. It does not save us from the necessity of contradicting Herodotus in most of his particulars; there may perhaps have been an interview between Solon and Cræsus in B.C. 570, but it cannot be the interview described by Herodotus. That interview takes place within ten years after the promulgation of Solon's laws—at the maximum of the power of Cræsus, and after numerous conquests effected by himself as king—at a time when Cræsus had a son old enough to be married and to command armies (Herod. i. 35)—at a time moreover immediately preceding the turn of his fortunes from prosperity to adversity, first in the death of his son, succeeded by two years of mourning, which were put an end to (*πένθος ἀπέπαυσε*, Herod. i. 46) by the stimulus of war with the Persians. That war, if we read the events of it as described in Herodotus, cannot have lasted more than three or four years,—so that the interview between Solon and Cræsus, as Herodotus

But even if no chronological objections existed, the moral purpose of the tale is so prominent, and pervades it so systematically from beginning to end, that these internal grounds are of themselves sufficiently strong to impeach its credibility as a matter of fact, unless such doubts happen to be outweighed—which in this case they are not—by good contemporary testimony. The narrative of Solon and Cræsus can be taken for nothing else but an illustrative fiction, borrowed by Herodotus from some philosopher, and clothed in his own peculiar beauty of expression, which on this occasion is more decidedly poetical than is habitual with him. I cannot transcribe, and I hardly dare to abridge it. The vain-glorious Cræsus, at the summit of his conquests and his riches, endeavours to win from his visitor Solon an opinion that he is the happiest of mankind. The latter, after having twice preferred to him modest and meritorious Grecian citizens, at length reminds him that his vast wealth and power are of a tenure too precarious to serve as an evidence of happiness—that the gods are jealous and meddlesome, and often make the show of happiness a mere prelude to extreme disaster—and that no man's life can be called happy until the whole of it has been played out, so that it may be seen to be out of the reach of reverses. Cræsus treats this opinion as absurd, but "a great judge-

conceived it, may be fairly stated to have occurred within seven years before the capture of Sardis.

If we put together all these conditions, it will appear that the interview recounted by Herodotus is a chronological impossibility: and Niebuhr (*Rom. Gesch.* vol. i. p. 579) is right in saying that the historian has fallen into a mistake of ten olympiads or forty years; his recital would consist with chronology, if we suppose that the Solonian legislation were referable to 554 B.C., and not to 594.

In my judgement, this is an illustrative tale, in which certain real characters—Cræsus and Solon—and certain real facts—the great power and succeeding ruin of the former by the victorious arm of Cyrus—together with certain facts probably altogether fictitious, such as the two sons of Cræsus, the Phrygian Adrastus and his history, the hunting of the mischievous wild bear on Mount Olympus—the ultimate preservation of Cræsus, &c., are put together so as to convey an impressive moral lesson. The whole adventure of Adrastus and the son of Cræsus is depicted in language eminently beautiful and poetical.

Plutarch treats the impressiveness and suitableness of this narrative as the best proof of its historical truth, and puts aside the chronological tables as unworthy of trust. Upon which reasoning Mr. Clinton has the following very just remarks:—"Plutarch must have had a very imperfect idea of the nature of historical evidence, if he could imagine that the suitableness of a story to the character of Solon was a better argument for its authenticity than the number of witnesses by whom it is attested. Those who invented the scene (assuming it to be a fiction) would surely have had the skill to adapt the discourse to the character of the actors" (p. 300).

To make this remark quite complete, it would be necessary to add the words "*trustworthiness and means of knowledge*," in addition to the "*number*" of attesting witnesses. And it is a remark the more worthy of notice, inasmuch as Mr. Clinton here pointedly adverts to the existence of *plausible fiction*, as being completely distinct from attested matter of fact—a distinction of which he took no account in his vindication of the historical credibility of the early Greek legends.

ment from God fell upon him, after Solon was departed—probably (observes Herodotus) because he fancied himself the happiest of all men.” First he lost his favourite son Atys, a brave and intelligent youth (his only other son being dumb). For the Mysians of Olympus, being ruined by a destructive and formidable wild boar which they were unable to subdue, applied for aid to Cræsus, who sent to the spot a chosen hunting force, and permitted—though with great reluctance, in consequence of an alarming dream—that his favourite son should accompany them. The young prince was unintentionally slain by the Phrygian exile Adrastus, whom Cræsus had sheltered and protected.¹ Hardly had the latter recovered from the anguish of this misfortune, when the rapid growth of Cyrus and the Persian power induced him to go to war with them, against the advice of his wisest counsellors. After a struggle of about three years he was completely defeated, his capital Sardis taken by storm, and himself made prisoner. Cyrus ordered a large pile to be prepared, and placed upon it Cræsus in fetters, together with fourteen young Lydians, in the intention of burning them alive, either as a religious offering, or in fulfilment of a vow, “or perhaps (says Herodotus) to see whether some of the gods would not interfere to rescue a man so pre-eminently pious as the king of Lydia.”² In this sad extremity, Cræsus bethought him of the warning which he had before despised, and thrice pronounced, with a deep groan, the name of Solon. Cyrus desired the interpreters to inquire whom he was invoking, and learnt in reply the anecdote of the Athenian lawgiver, together with the solemn memento which he had offered to Cræsus during more prosperous days, attesting the frail tenure of all human greatness. The remark sunk deep into the Persian monarch, as a token of what might happen to himself: he repented of his purpose, and directed that the pile, which had already been kindled, should be immediately extinguished. But the orders came too late. In spite of the most zealous efforts of the bystanders, the flame was found unquenchable, and Cræsus would still have been burnt, had he not implored with prayers and tears the succour of Apollo, to

¹ Herod. i. 32. Ὡς Κροῖσος, ἐπιστάμενον με τὸ θεῖον, πᾶν ἔδν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχώδες, ἐπειρωτᾶς με ἀνθρωπότητων πραγμάτων πέρι. i. 34. Μετὰ δὲ Σόλωνα οἰχόμενον, ἔλαβεν ἐκ θεοῦ νέμεσις μεγάλη Κροῖσον, ὥς εἰκάσαι ὅτι ἐνόμισε ἐωϋτὸν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων ὀλβιώτατον.

The hunting-match, and the terrible wild boar with whom the Mysians can-

not cope, appear to be borrowed from the legend of Kalydon.

The whole scene of Adrastus, returning after the accident in a state of desperate remorse, praying for death with outstretched hands, spared by Cræsus, and then killing himself on the tomb of the young prince, is deeply tragic (Herod. i. 44-45).

² Herodot. i. 85.

whose Delphian and Theban temples he had given such munificent presents. His prayers were heard, the fair sky was immediately overcast, and a profuse rain descended, sufficient to extinguish the flames.¹ The life of Croesus was thus saved, and he became afterwards the confidential friend and adviser of his conqueror.

Such is the brief outline of a narrative which Herodotus has given with full development and with impressive effect. It would have served as a show-lecture to the youth of Athens not less admirably than the well-known fable of the Choice of Hêraklês, which the philosopher Prodikus,² a junior contemporary of Herodotus, delivered with so much popularity. It illustrates forcibly the religious and ethical ideas of antiquity; the deep sense of the jealousy of the gods, who would not endure pride in any one except themselves;³ the impossibility, for any man, of realising to himself more than a very moderate share of happiness; the danger from reactionary Nemesis, if at any time he had overpassed such limit; and the necessity of calculations taking in the whole of life, as a basis for rational comparison of different individuals. And it embodies, as a practical consequence from these feelings, the often-repeated protest of moralists against vehement impulses and unrestrained aspirations. The more valuable this narrative appears, in its illustrative character, the less can we presume to treat it as a history.

It is much to be regretted that we have no information respecting events in Attica immediately after the Solonian laws and constitution, which were promulgated in 594 B.C., so as to understand better the practical effect of these changes. What we next hear respecting Solon in Attica refers to a period immediately preceding the first usurpation of Peisistratus in 560 B.C., and after the return of Solon from his long absence. We are here again introduced to the same oligarchical dissensions as are reported to have prevailed before the Solonian legislation: the Pedieis, or opulent proprietors of the plain round Athens, under Lykurgus; the Parali of the south of Attica, under Megaklês; and the Diakrii or mountaineers of the eastern cantons, the poorest of the three classes, under Peisistratus, are in a state of violent intestine dispute. The account of Plutarch

Moral lesson
arising out
of the narra-
tive.

State of
Attica after
the Solonian
legislation.

Return of
Solon to
Athens.

¹ Herodot. i. 86, 87; compare Plutarch, Solon, 27-28. See a similar story about Gyges king of Lydia (Valerius Maxim. vii. 1, 2).

² Xenoph. Memorab. ii. 1, 21. Πρόδικος ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι τῷ περὶ

Ἡρακλέους, ὅπερ δὴ καὶ πλείστοις ἐπιδείκνυται, &c.

³ Herodot. vii. 10. φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολοῦειν . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐὰν φρονέειν μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἄλλον ἢ ἐωϋτόν.

represents Solon as returning to Athens during the height of this sedition. He was treated with respect by all parties, but his recommendations were no longer obeyed, and he was disqualified by age from acting with effect in public. He employed his best efforts to mitigate party animosities, and applied himself particularly to restrain the ambition of Peisistratus, whose ulterior projects he quickly detected.

The future greatness of Peisistratus is said to have been first portended by a miracle which happened, even before his birth, to his father Hippokratês at the Olympic games. It was realised, partly by his bravery and conduct, which had been displayed in the capture of Nisæa from the Megarians¹—partly by his popularity of speech and manners, his championship of the

Rise of Pei-
sistratus.

¹ Herodot. i. 59. I record this allusion to Nisæa and the Megarian war, because I find it distinctly stated in Herodotus; and because it *may* possibly refer to some other *later* war between Athens and Megara than that which is mentioned in Plutarch's Life of Solon as having taken place before the Solonian legislation (that is, before 594 B.C.), and therefore nearly forty years before this movement of Peisistratus to acquire the despotism. Peisistratus must then have been so young that he could not with any propriety be said to have "captured Nisæa" (*Νισαίων τε ἔλαβον*): moreover the public reputation, which was found useful to the ambition of Peisistratus in 560 B.C., must have rested upon something more recent than his bravery displayed about 597 B.C.—just as the celebrity which enabled Napoleon to play the game of successful ambition on the 18th Brumaire (Nov. 1799) was obtained by victories gained within the preceding five years, and could not have been represented by any historian as resting upon victories gained in the Seven Years' war, between 1756–1763.

At the same time my belief is, that the words of Herodotus respecting Peisistratus do really refer to the Megarian war mentioned in Plutarch's Life of Solon, and that Herodotus supposed that Megarian war to have been much more near to the despotism of Peisistratus than it really was. In the conception of Herodotus, and by what (after Niebuhr) I venture to call a mistake in his chronology, the interval between 600–560 B.C. shrinks from forty years to little or nothing. Such mistake appears, not only on the present occa-

sion, but also upon two others: first, in regard to the alleged dialogue between Solon and Cræsus, described and commented upon a few pages above; next, in regard to the poet Alkæus and his inglorious retreat before the Athenian troops at Sigeium and Achilleium, where he lost his shield, when the Mityleneans were defeated. The reality of this incident is indisputable, since it was mentioned by Alkæus himself in one of his songs; but Herodotus represents it to have occurred in an Athenian expedition *directed by Peisistratus*. Now the war in which Alkæus incurred this misfortune, and which was brought to a close by the mediation of Periander of Corinth, must have taken place earlier than 584 B.C., and probably took place before the legislation of Solon; long before the time when Peisistratus had the direction of Athenian affairs—though the latter may have carried on, and probably did carry on, *another and a later war* against the Mityleneans in those regions, which led to the introduction of his illegitimate son Hegesistratus as despot of Sigeium (Herod. v. 94, 95).

If we follow the representation given by Herodotus of these three different strings of events, we shall see that the same chronological mistake pervades all of them—he jumps over nearly ten olympiads, or forty years. Alkæus is the contemporary of Pittakus and Solon.

I have already remarked, in the previous chapter respecting the despots of Sikyôn (Ch. ix.), another instance of confused chronology in Herodotus respecting the events of this period—respecting Cræsus, Megaklês, Alkmæôn and Kleisthenês of Sikyôn.

poor,¹ and his ostentatious disavowal of all selfish pretensions—partly by an artful mixture of stratagem and force. Solon, after having addressed fruitless remonstrances to Peisistratus himself, publicly denounced his designs in verses addressed to the people. The deception, whereby Peisistratus finally accomplished his design, is memorable in Grecian tradition.² He appeared one day in the agora of Athens in his chariot with a pair of mules: he had intentionally wounded both his person and the mules, and in this condition he threw himself upon the compassion and defence of the people, pretending that his political enemies had violently attacked him. He implored the people to grant him a guard, and at the moment when their sympathies were freshly aroused both in his favour and against his supposed assassins, Aristo proposed formally to the Ekklesia (the pro-bouleutic senate, being composed of friends of Peisistratus, had previously authorised the proposition)³ that a company of fifty club-men should be assigned as a permanent body-guard for the defence of Peisistratus. To this motion Solon opposed a strenuous resistance,⁴ but found himself overborne, and even treated as if he had lost his senses. The poor were earnest in favour of it, while the rich were afraid to express their dissent; and he could only comfort himself after the fatal vote had been passed, by exclaiming that he was wiser than the former and more determined than the latter. Such was one of the first known instances in which this memorable stratagem was played off against the liberty of a Grecian community.

His memorable stratagem to procure a guard from the people.

The unbounded popular favour which had procured the passing of this grant was still farther manifested by the absence of all precautions to prevent the limits of the grant from being exceeded. The number of the body-guard was not long confined to fifty, and probably their clubs were soon exchanged for sharper weapons. Peisistratus thus found himself strong enough to throw off the mask and seize the Akropolis. His leading opponents, Megaklēs and the Alkmæonids, immediately fled the city, and it was left to the venerable age and undaunted patriotism of Solon to stand forward almost alone in a vain attempt to resist the usurpation. He publicly presented himself in the market-place, employing encouragement, remonstrance and re-

Peisistratus seizes the Akropolis—courageous resistance of Solon.

¹ Aristot. Politic. v. 4, 5; Plutarch, Solon, 29.

² Plato, Republic, viii. p. 565. τὸ τυραννικὸν αἶτημα τὸ πολυθρυλλητὸν . . . αἰτεῖν τὸν δῆμον φύλακὰς τινὰς τοῦ σώματος, ἵνα σώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἢ ὁ τοῦ

δῆμον βοηθός.

³ Diog. Laërt. i. 49. ἡ βουλὴ, Πεισιστράτιδαι ὄντες, &c.

⁴ Plutarch, Solon, 29, 30; Diog. Laërt. i. 50, 51.

proach, in order to rouse the spirit of the people. To prevent this despotism from coming (he told them) would have been easy; to shake it off now was more difficult, yet at the same time more glorious.¹ But he spoke in vain, for all who were not actually favourable to Peisistratus listened only to their fears, and remained passive; nor did any one join Solon, when, as a last appeal, he put on his armour and planted himself in military posture before the door of his house. "I have done my duty (he exclaimed at length); I have sustained to the best of my power my country and the laws:" and he then renounced all farther hope of opposition—though resisting the instances of his friends that he should flee, and returning for answer, when they asked him on what he relied for protection, "On my old age." Nor did he even think it necessary to repress the inspirations of his Muse. Some verses yet remain, composed seemingly at a moment when the strong hand of the new despot had begun to make itself sorely felt, in which he tells his countrymen—"If ye have endured sorrow from your own baseness of soul, impute not the fault of this to the gods. Ye have yourselves put force and dominion into the hands of these men, and have thus drawn upon yourselves wretched slavery."

It is gratifying to learn that Peisistratus, whose conduct throughout his despotism was comparatively mild, left Solon untouched. How long this distinguished man survived the practical subversion of his own constitution, we cannot certainly determine; but accord-

Death of Solon—his character. ing to the most probable statement he died during the very next year, at the advanced age of eighty.

We have only to regret that we are deprived of the means of following more in detail his noble and exemplary character. He represents the best tendencies of his age, combined with much that is personally excellent; the improved ethical sensibility; the thirst for enlarged knowledge and observation, not less potent in old age than in youth; the conception of regularised popular institutions, departing sensibly from the type and spirit of the governments around him, and calculated to found a new character in the Athenian people; a genuine and reflecting sympathy with the mass of the poor, anxious not merely to rescue them from the oppressions of the rich, but also to create in them habits of self-relying industry; lastly, during his temporary possession of a power altogether arbitrary, not merely an absence of all selfish ambition, but a rare discretion in seizing the mean between conflicting exigencies. In reading his poems we must always recollect that what now appears

¹ Plutarch, Solon, 30; Diogen. Laërt. i. 49; Diodor. Excerpta, lib. vii.-x., ed. Maii. Fr. xix.-xxiv.

common-place was once new, so that to his comparatively unlettered age, the social pictures which he draws were still fresh, and his exhortations calculated to live in the memory. The poems composed on moral subjects generally inculcate a spirit of gentleness towards others and moderation in personal objects. They represent the gods as irresistible, retributive, favouring the good and punishing the bad, though sometimes very tardily. But his compositions on special and present occasions are usually conceived in a more vigorous spirit; denouncing the oppressions of the rich at one time, and the timid submission to Peisistratus at another—and expressing in emphatic language his own proud consciousness of having stood forward as champion of the mass of the people. Of his early poems hardly anything is preserved. The few lines remaining seem to manifest a jovial temperament which we may well conceive to have been overlaid by such political difficulties as he had to encounter—difficulties arising successively out of the Megarian war, the Kylonian sacrilege, the public despondency healed by Epimenidês, and the task of arbiter between a rapacious oligarchy and a suffering people. In one of his elegies addressed to Mimnermus, he marked out the sixtieth year as the longest desirable period of life, in preference to the eightieth year, which that poet had expressed a wish to attain.¹ But his own life, as far as we can judge, seems to have reached the longer of the two periods; and not the least honourable part of it (the resistance to Peisistratus) occurs immediately before his death.

There prevailed a story, that his ashes were collected and scattered around the island of Salamis, which Plutarch treats as absurd—though he tells us at the same time that it was believed both by Aristotle and by many other considerable men. It is at least as ancient as the poet Kratinus, who alluded to it in one of his comedies, and I do not feel inclined to reject it.² The inscription on the statue of Solon at Athens described him as a Salaminian: he had been the great means of acquiring the island for his country: and it seems highly probable that among the new Athenian citizens, who went to settle there, he may have received a lot of land and become enrolled among the Salaminian demots. The dispersion of his ashes connecting him with the island as its *Ekist*, may be construed, if not as the expression of a public vote, at least

¹ Solon, Fragment 22, ed. Bergk. Isokratês affirms that Solon was the first person to whom the appellation *Sophist* (in later times carrying with it so much obloquy) was applied (Isokratês,

Or. xv. De Permutatione, p. 344; p. 496 Bek.).

² Plutarch, Solon, 32; Kratinus ap. Diogen. Laërt. i. 62.

as a piece of affectionate vanity on the part of his surviving friends.¹

We have now reached the period of the usurpation of Peisistratus (B.C. 560), whose dynasty governed Athens (with two temporary interruptions during the life of Peisistratus himself) for fifty years. The history of this despotism, milder than Grecian despotism generally, and productive of important consequences to Athens, will be reserved for a succeeding chapter.

APPENDIX.

The explanation which M. von Savigny gives of the *Nexi* and *Addicti* under the old Roman law of debtor and creditor (after he has refuted the elucidation of Niebuhr on the same subject), while it throws great light on the historical changes in Roman legislation on that important matter, sets forth at the same time the marked difference made in the procedure of Rome, between the demand of the creditor for repayment of *principal*, and the demand for payment of *interest*.

The primitive Roman law distinguished a debt arising from money lent (*pecunia certa credita*) from debts arising out of contract, delict, sale, &c., or any other source: the creditor on the former ground had a quick and easy process, by which he acquired the fullest power over the person and property of his debtor. After the debt on loan was either confessed or proved before the magistrate, thirty days were allowed to the debtor for payment: if payment was not made within that time, the creditor laid hold of him (*manus injectio*) and carried him before the magistrate again. The debtor was now again required either to pay or to find a surety (*vindex*); if neither of these demands were complied with, the creditor took possession of him and carried him home, where he kept him in chains for two months; during which interval he brought him before the prætor publicly on three successive nundinæ. If the debt was not paid within these two months, the sentence of addiction was pronounced, and the creditor became empowered either to put his debtor to death, or to sell him for a slave (p. 81), or to keep him at forced work, without any restriction as to the degree of ill-usage which might be inflicted upon him. The judgement of the magistrate authorised him, besides, to seize the property of his debtor wherever he could find any, within the limits sufficient for payment: this was one of the points which Niebuhr had denied.

Such was the old law of Rome, with respect to the consequences of an action for money had and received, for more than a century after the Twelve Tables. But the law did not apply this stringent personal execution to any debt except that arising from loan—and even in that debt only to the principal money, not to the interest—which latter had to be claimed by a process both more gentle and less efficient, applying to the property only and not to the person of the

¹ Aristidēs, in noticing this story of the spreading of the ashes of Solon in Salamis, treats him as Ἀρχηγέτης of the island (Orat. xlv. Ὑπὲρ τῶν τετρατάων, p. 172; p. 230 Dindorf). The inscription on his statue, which describes him as born in Salamis, can hardly have been literally true; for when he

was born, Salamis was not incorporated in Attica. But it may have been true by a sort of adoption (see Diogen. Laërt. i. 62). The statue seems to have been erected by the Salaminians themselves, a long time after Solon: see Menage ad Diogen. Laërt. l. c.

debtor. Accordingly it was to the advantage of the creditor to devise some means for bringing his claim of interest under the same stringent process as his claim for the principal; it was also to his advantage, if his claim arose, not out of money lent, but out of sale, compensation for injury, or any other source, to give to it *the form of an action for money lent*. Now the Nexum, or Nexi obligatio, was an artifice—a fictitious loan—whereby this purpose was accomplished. The severe process which legally belonged only to the recovery of the principal money, was extended by the Nexum so as to comprehend the interest; and so as to comprehend also claims for money arising from all other sources (as well as from loan), wherein the law gave no direct recourse except against the property of a debtor. The Debtor Nexus was made liable by this legal artifice to pass into the condition of an Addictus, either without having borrowed money at all, or for the interest as well as for the principal of that which he had borrowed.

The Lex Pœtelia, passed about B.C. 325, liberated all the Nexi then under liability, and interdicted the Nexi obligatio for ever afterwards (Cicero, De Republ. ii. 34; Livy, viii. 28). Here, as in the Seisachtheia of Solon, the existing contracts were cancelled, at the same time that the whole class of similar contracts were forbidden for the future.

But though the Nexi obligatio was thus abolished, the old stringent remedy still continued against the debtor on loan, *as far as the principal sum borrowed*, apart from interest. Some mitigations were introduced: by Lex Julia, the still more important provision was added, that the debtor by means of a Cessio Bonorum might save his person from seizure. But this Cessio Bonorum was coupled with conditions which could not always be fulfilled, nor was the debtor admitted to the benefit of it, if he had been guilty of carelessness or dishonesty. Accordingly the old stringent process, and the addiction in which it ended, though it became less frequent, still continued throughout the course of Imperial Rome, and even down to the time of Justinian. The private prison, with adjudicated debtors working in it, was still the appendage to a Roman money-lender's house, even in the third and fourth centuries after the Christian æra, though the practice seems to have become rarer and rarer. The status of the *Addictus Debitor*, with its peculiar rights and obligations, is discussed by Quintilian (vii. 3); and Aulus Gellius (A.D. 160) observes—“*Addici namque nunc et vinciri multos videmus, quia vinculorum pœnam deterrimi homines contemnunt.*” (xx. 1.)

If the *Addictus Debitor* was adjudged to several creditors, they were allowed by the Twelve Tables to divide his body among them. No example was known of this power having been ever carried into effect, but the law was understood to give the power distinctly.

It is useful to have before us the old Roman law of debtor and creditor, partly as a point of comparison with the ante-Solonian practice in Attica, partly to illustrate the difference drawn in an early state of society between the claim for the principal and the claim for the interest.

See the Abhandlung of Von Savigny in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy for 1833, p. 70–103; the subject is also treated by the same admirable expositor in his *System des heutigen Römischen Rechts*, vol. v. sect. 219, and in *Beilage* xiv. 10, 11 of that volume.

The same peculiar stringent process, which was available in the case of an action for *pecunia certa credita*, was also specially extended to the surety, who had paid down money to liquidate another man's debt: the debtor, if insolvent, became his Addictus—this was the *Actio Depensi*. I have already remarked in a former note, that in the Attic law, a case analogous to this was the only one in which the original remedy against the person of the debtor was always maintained. When a man had paid money to redeem a citizen from captivity, the

latter, if he did not repay it, became the slave of the party who had advanced the money.

Walter (*Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, sect. 583-715, 2nd ed.) calls in question the above explanation of Von Savigny, on grounds which do not appear to me sufficient.

How long the feeling continued, that it was immoral and irreligious to receive any interest at all for money lent, may be seen from the following notice respecting the state of the law in France even down to 1789:—

“Avant la Révolution Française (de 1789) le prêt à intérêt n'était pas également admis dans les diverses parties du royaume. Dans les pays de droit écrit, il était permis de stipuler l'intérêt des deniers prêtés : mais la jurisprudence des parlemens résistait souvent à cet usage. Suivant le droit commun des pays coutumiers, on ne pouvait stipuler aucun intérêt pour le prêt appelé en droit *mutuum*. On tenait pour maxime que l'argent ne produisant rien par lui-même, un tel prêt devait être gratuit : que la perception d'intérêts était une usure : à cet égard, on admettait assez généralement les principes du droit canonique. Du reste, la législation et la jurisprudence variaient suivant les localités et suivant la nature des contrats et des obligations.” (*Carette, Lois Annotées, ou Lois, Décrets, Ordonnances, Paris 1843; Note sur le Décret de l'Assemblée Nationale concernant le Prêt et Intérêt, Août 11, 1789.*)

The National Assembly declared the legality of all loans on interest, “suivant le taux déterminé par la loi,” but did not then fix any special rate. “Le décret du 11 Avril 1793 défendit la vente et l'achat du numéraire.” “La loi du 6 floréal, an III, déclara que l'or et l'argent sont marchandises ; mais elle fut rapportée par le décret du 2 prairial suivant. Les articles 1905 et 1907 du Code Civil permettent le prêt à intérêt, mais au taux fixé ou autorisé par la loi. La loi du 3 Sept. 1807 a fixé le taux d'intérêt à 5 per cent. en matière civile et à 6 per cent. en matière commerciale.”

The article on Lending-houses, in Beckmann's *History of Inventions* (vol. iii. pp. 9-50), is highly interesting and instructive on the same subject. It traces the gradual calling in question, mitigation, and disappearance, of the ancient antipathy against taking interest for money ; an antipathy long sanctioned by the ecclesiastics as well as by the jurists. Lending-houses, or *Monts de Piété*, were first commenced in Italy about the middle of the fifteenth century, by some Franciscan monks, for the purpose of rescuing poor borrowers from the exorbitant exactions of the Jews : Pope Pius II. (*Æneas Silvius*, one of the ablest of the Popes, about 1458-1464) was the first who approved of one of them at Perugia, but even the papal sanction was long combated by a large proportion of ecclesiastics. At first it was to be purely charitable ; not only neither giving interest to those who contributed money, nor taking interest from the borrowers—but not even providing fixed pay to the administrators : interest was tacitly taken, but the popes were a long time before they would formally approve of such a practice. “At Vicenza, in order to avoid the reproach of usury, the artifice was employed of not demanding any interest, but admonishing the borrowers that they should give a remuneration according to their piety and ability.” (p. 31.) The Dominicans, partisans of the old doctrine, called these establishments *Montes Impietatis*. A Franciscan monk, Bernardinus, one of the most active promoters of the *Monts de Piété*, did not venture to defend, but only to excuse as an unavoidable evil, the payment of wages to the clerks and administrators : “*Speciosius et religiosius fatebatur Bernardinus fore, si absque ullo penitus obolo et pretio mutuum daretur et commodaretur libere pecunia, sed pium opus et pauperum subsidium exiguo sic duraturum tempore. Non enim (inquit) tantus est ardor hominum, ut gubernatores et officiales, Montium ministerio necessarii, velint laborem hunc omnem gratis subire: quod si remunerandi sint ex sorte principali, vel ipso deposito, seu exili Montium arario, brevi ex-*

haurietur, et commodum opportunumque istud pauperum refugium ubique peribit." (p. 33.)

The council of Trent, during the following century, pronounced in favour of the legality and usefulness of these lending-houses, and this has since been understood to be the sentiment of the Catholic church generally.

To trace this gradual change of moral feeling is highly instructive—the more so, as that general basis of sentiment, of which the antipathy against lending money on interest is only a particular case, still prevails largely in society and directs the current of moral approbation and disapprobation. In some nations, as among the ancient Persians before Cyrus, this sentiment has been carried so far as to repudiate and despise all buying and selling. (Herodot. i. 153.) With many, the principle of reciprocity in human dealings appears, when conceived in theory, odious and contemptible, and goes by some bad name, such as egoism, selfishness, calculation, political economy, &c.: the only sentiment which they will admit in theory, is, that the man who has, ought to be ready at all times to give away to him who has not; while the latter is encouraged to expect and require such gratuitous donation.

CHAPTER XII.

EUBŒA.—CYCLADES.

AMONG the Ionic portion of Hellas are to be reckoned (besides The islands called Cyclades. Athens) Eubœa, and the numerous group of islands included between the southernmost Eubœan promontory, the eastern coast of Peloponnesus and the north-western coast of Krête. Of these islands some are to be considered as outlying prolongations, in a south-easterly direction, of the mountain-system of Attica; others, of that of Eubœa; while a certain number of them lie apart from either system, and seem referable to a volcanic origin.¹ To the first class belong Keôs, Kythnus, Serîphus, Pholegandrus, Sikinus, Gyarus, Syra, Paros, and Antiparos; to the second class, Andros, Tênos, Mykonos, Dêlos, Naxos, Amorgos; to the third class, Kimôlus, Mêlos, Thêra. These islands passed amongst the ancients by the general names of Cyclades and Sporades; the former denomination being commonly understood to comprise those which immediately surrounded the sacred island of Dêlos,—the latter being given to those which lay more scattered and apart. But the names are not applied with uniformity or steadiness even in ancient times: at present, the whole group are usually known by the title of Cyclades.

The population of these islands was called Ionic—with the exception of Styra and Karystus in the southern part of Eubœa, and the island of Kythnus, which were peopled by Dryopes,² the same tribe as those who have been already remarked in the Argolic peninsula; and with the exception also of Mêlos and Thêra, which were colonies from Sparta.

The island of Eubœa, long and narrow like Krête, and exhibiting a continuous backbone of lofty mountains from north-west to south-east, is separated from Bœotia at one point by a strait so narrow (celebrated in antiquity under the name of the Eurîpus), that the two were connected by a bridge for a large portion of the historical period of Greece, erected during the later

¹ See Fiedler, *Reisen durch Griechenland*, vol. ii. p. 87.

² Herodot. viii. 46; Thucyd. vii. 57.

times of the Peloponnesian war by the inhabitants of Chalkis.¹ Its general want of breadth leaves little room for plains. The area of the island consists principally of mountain, rock, dell, and ravine, suited in many parts for pasture, but rarely convenient for grain-culture or town habitations. Some plains there were, however, of great fertility, especially that of Lelantum,² bordering on the sea near Chalkis, and continuing from that city in a southerly direction towards Eretria. Chalkis and Eretria, both situated on the western coast, and both occupying parts of this fertile plain, were the two principal places in the island: the domain of each seems to have extended across the island from sea to sea.³ Towards the northern end of the island were situated Histiaæ, afterwards called Oreus—as well as Kêrinthus and Dium: Athênæ Diades, Ædêpus, Ægæ, and Orobiaæ, are also mentioned on the north-western coast over against Lokris. Dystus, Styra, and Karystus are made known to us in the portion of the island south of Eretria—the two latter opposite to the Attic demes Halæ Araphênides and Prasiaæ.⁴ The wide extent of the island of Eubœa was thus distributed between six or seven cities, the larger and central portion belonging to Chalkis and Eretria. But the extensive mountain lands, applicable only for pastures in the summer—for the most part public lands, let out for pasture to such proprietors as had the means of providing winter sustenance elsewhere for their cattle,—were never visited by any one except the shepherds. They were hardly better known to the citizens resident in Chalkis and Eretria than if they had been situated on the other side of the Ægean.⁵

Its six or
seven towns
—Chalkis
Eretria, &c.

¹ Diodor. xiii. 47.

² Kallimachus, Hymn. ad Delum, 289, with Spanheim's note; Theognis, v. 888; Theophrast. Hist. Plant. 8, 5.

See Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, vol. ii. ch. 14. p. 254, *seq.* The passage of Theognis leads to the belief that Kêrinthus formed part of the territory of Chalkis.

³ Skylax (c. 59) treats the island of Skyrus as opposite to Eretria, the territory of which must therefore have included a portion of the eastern coast of Eubœa, as well as the western. He recognises only four cities in the island—Karystus, Eretria, Chalkis, and Hestiaæ.

⁴ Mannert, Geograph. Gr. Röm. part. viii. book i. c. 16. p. 248; Strabo, x. p. 445–449.

⁵ The seventh Oration of Dio Chrysostom, which describes his shipwreck near Cape Kaphareus, on the island of

Eubœa, and the shelter and kindness which he experienced from a poor mountain huntsman, presents one of the most interesting pictures remaining, of this purely rustic portion of the Greek population (Or. vii. p. 221 *seq.*)—men who never entered the city, and were strangers to the habits, manners, and dress there prevailing—men who drank milk and were clothed in skins (*γαλακτοπότας ἀνὴρ, οὐρεϊβάτας*, Eurip. Elektr. 169), yet nevertheless (as it seems) possessing right of citizenship (p. 238) which they never exercised. The industry of the poor men visited by Dion had brought into cultivation a little garden and field in a desert spot near Kaphareus.

Two-thirds of the territory of this Euboic city consisted of barren mountain (p. 232); it must probably have been Karystus.

The towns above enumerated in Eubœa, excepting Athenæ Diades, all find a place in the Iliad. Of their history <sup>How peo-
pled.</sup> we know no particulars until considerably after 776 B. C. They are first introduced to us as Ionic, though in Homer the population are called Abantes. The Greek authors are never at a loss to give us the etymology of a name. While Aristotle tells us that the Abantes were Thracians who had passed over into the island from Abæ in Phokis, Hesiod deduces the name of Eubœa from the cow Iô.¹ Hellopia, a district near Histiaæa, was said to have been founded by Hellops son of Ion: according to others, Æklus and Kothus, two Athenians,² were the founders, the former of Eretria, the latter of Chalkis and Kêrinthus: and we are told, that among the demes of Attica, there were two named Histiaæa and Eretria, from whence some contended that the appellations of the two Eubœan towns were derived. Though Herodotus represents the population of Styra as Dryopian, there were others who contended that the town had originally been peopled from Marathon and the Tetrapolis of Attica, partly from the deme called Steireis. The principal writers whom Strabo consulted seem to trace the population of Eubœa, by one means or another, to an Attic origin; though there were peculiarities in the Eretrian dialect which gave rise to the supposition that they had been joined by settlers from Elis, or from the Triphylian Makistus.

Our earliest historical intimations represent Chalkis and Eretria as the wealthiest, most powerful, and most enterprising <sup>Early power
of Chalkis,
Eretria,
Naxos, &c.</sup> Ionic cities in European Greece—apparently surpassing Athens, and not inferior to Samos or Miletus. Besides the fertility of the plain Lelantum, Chalkis possessed the advantage of copper and iron ore—obtained in immediate proximity both to the city and to the sea—which her citizens smelted and converted into arms and other implements, with a very profitable result. The Chalkidic sword acquired a distinctive renown.³ In

The high lands of Eubœa were both uninhabited and difficult of approach, even at the time of the battle of Marathon, when Chalkis and Eretria had not greatly declined from the maximum of their power: the inhabitants of Eretria looked to τὰ ἄκρα τῆς Εὐβοίης as a refuge against the Persian force under Datis (Herod. vii. 100).

¹ Strabo, x. p. 445.

² Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 296: Strab. x. p. 446 (whose statements are very perplexed); Velleius Patercul. i. 4.

According to Skymnus the Chian (v.

572), Chalkis was founded by Pandôrus son of Erechtheus, and Kêrinthus by Kothôn, from Athens.

³ Strabo, x. p. 446.—Πὰρ δὲ Χαλκιδικὰ σπάθαι (Alkæus, Fragm. 7, Schneide-
win)—Χαλκιδικὸν ποτήριον (Aristophan. Equit. 237)—certainly belongs to the Euboic Chalkis, not to the Thracian Chalkidikê. Boeckh, Staatshaushalt. der Athener, vol. ii. p. 284. App. xi., cites Χαλκιδικὰ ποτήρια in an inscription; compare Steph. Byz. Χαλκίς.—Ναυσι-
κλείτης Εὐβοίης, Homer, Hymn. Apoll. 219.

this mineral source of wealth several of the other islands shared: iron ore is found in Keôs, Kythnus, and Seriphus, and traces are still evident in the latter island of extensive smelting formerly practised.¹ Moreover in Siphnus, there were in early times veins of silver and gold, by which the inhabitants were greatly enriched; though their large acquisitions, attested by the magnitude of the tithe² which they offered at the Delphian temple, were only of temporary duration, and belong principally to the seventh and sixth centuries before the Christian æra. The island of Naxos too was at an early day wealthy and populous. Andros, Tenôs, Keôs, and several other islands, were at one time reduced to dependence upon Eretria:³ other islands seem to have been in like manner dependent upon Naxos, which at the time immediately preceding the Ionic revolt possessed a considerable maritime force, and could muster 8000 heavy-armed citizens⁴—a very large force for any single Grecian city. The military force of Eretria was not much inferior; for in the temple of the Amarynthian Artemis, nearly a mile from the city, to which the Eretrians were in the habit of marching in solemn procession to celebrate the festival of the goddess, there stood an ancient column setting forth that the procession had been performed by no less than 3000 hoplites, 600 horsemen, and 60 chariots.⁵ The date of this inscription cannot be known, but it can hardly be earlier than the 45th Olympiad, or 600 B.C.—near about the time of the Solonian legislation. Chalkis was still more powerful than Eretria: both were in early times governed by an oligarchy, which among the Chalkidians was called the Hippobotæ or Horsefeeders—proprietors probably of most part of the plain called Lelantum, and employing the adjoining mountains as summer pasture for their herds. The extent of their property is attested by the large number of 4000

¹ See the mineralogical account of the islands in Fiedler (Reisen, vol. ii. pp. 88, 118, 562).

The copper and iron ore near Chalkis had ceased to be worked even in the time of Strabo; Fiedler indicates the probable site (vol. i. p. 443).

² Herodot. iii. 57. Siphnus, however, was still of considerable wealth and importance about 380 B.C.—see Isokrates, Or. xix. (Ægin.) s. 9–47. The Siphnians, in an evil hour, committed the wrong of withholding their tithe: the sea soon rushed in and rendered the mines ever afterwards unworkable (Pausan. x. 11, 2).

³ Strabo, x. p. 448.

⁴ Herodot. v. 31. Compare the accounts of these various islands in the recent voyages of Professor Ross, Reisen auf den Griechischen Inseln, vol. i. letter 2; vol. ii. letter 15.

The population of Naxos is now about 11,000 souls; that of Andros 15,000 (Ross, vol. i. p. 28; vol. ii. p. 22).

But the extent and fertility of the Naxian plain perfectly suffice for that aggregate population of 100,000 souls, which seems implied in the account of Herodotus.

⁵ Strabo, l. c.

Kleruchs or out-freemen, whom Athens quartered upon their lands, after the victory gained over them when they assisted the expelled Hippias in his efforts to regain the Athenian sceptre.¹

Confining our attention, as we now do, to the first two centuries of Grecian history, or the interval between 776 B.C. and 560 B.C., there are scarce any facts which we can produce to ascertain the condition of these Ionic islands. Two or three circumstances however may be named which go to confirm our idea of their early wealth and importance.

1. The Homeric Hymn to Apollo presents to us the island of Dêlos as the centre of a great periodical festival in honour of Apollo, celebrated by all the cities, insular and continental, of the Ionic name. What the date of this hymn is, we have no means of determining. Thucydides quotes it without hesitation as the production of Homer, and doubtless it was in his time universally accepted as such—though modern critics concur in regarding both that and the other hymns as much later than the Iliad and Odyssey. Yet it cannot probably be later than 600 B.C. The description of the Ionic visitors presented to us in this hymn is splendid and imposing. The number of their ships, the display of their finery, the beauty of their women, the athletic exhibitions as well as the matches of song and dance—all these are represented as making an ineffaceable impression on the spectator:² “the assembled Ionians look as if they were beyond the reach of old age or death.” Such was the magnificence of which Dêlos was the periodical theatre, calling forth the voices and poetical genius not merely of itinerant bards, but also of the Delian maidens in the temple of Apollo, during the century preceding 560 B.C. At that time it was the great central festival of the Ionians in Asia and Europe; frequented by the twelve Ionic cities in and near Asia Minor, as well as by Athens and Chalkis in Europe. It had not yet been superseded by the Ephesia as the exclusive festival of these Asiatics; nor had the Panathenæa of Athens reached the importance which afterwards came to belong to them during the plenitude of the Athenian power.

We find both Polykratês of Samos, and Peisistratus of Athens,

¹ Herodot. v. 77; Aristoteles, Fragment. *περὶ Πολιτειῶν*, ed. Neumann, p. 111-112: compare Aristot. Polit. iv. 3, 2.

² Hom. Hymn. Apoll. Del. 146-176; Thucyd. iii. 104:

Φαίη κ' ἄθανάτους καὶ ἀγήρωσ ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ,
Ὅς τότ' ἐπαντιάσει' ὅτ' Ἰαόνες ἄθροοι εἴεν·
Πάντων γάρ κεν ἴδοιτο χάριν, τέρψαιτο δὲ θυμὸν,
Ἄνδρας τ' εἰσπορών, καλλιζώνους τε γυναῖκας,
Νῆας τ' ὠκείας, ἧδ' αὐτῶν χρήματα πολλά.

taking a warm interest in the sanctity of Dêlos and the celebrity of her festival.¹ But it was partly the rise of these two great Ionian despots, partly the conquests of the Persians in Asia Minor, which broke up the independence of the numerous petty Ionian cities, during the last half of the sixth century before the Christian æra; hence the great festival at Dêlos gradually declined in importance. Though never wholly intermitted, it was shorn of much of its previous ornament, and especially of that which constituted the first of all ornaments—the crowd of joyous visitors. And Thucydidês, when he notices the attempt made by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war, in the height of their naval supremacy, to revive the Delian festival, quotes the Homeric Hymn to Apollo as a certificate of its foregone and long-forgotten splendour. We perceive that even *he* could find no better evidence than this hymn, for Grecian transactions of a century anterior to Peisistratus—and we may therefore judge how imperfectly the history of this period was known to the men who took part in the Peloponnesian war. The hymn is exceedingly precious as an historical document, because it attests to us a transitory glory and extensive association of the Ionic Greeks on both sides of the Ægean Sea, which the conquests of the Lydians first, and of the Persians afterwards, overthrew—a time when the hair of the wealthy Athenian was decorated with golden ornaments, and his tunic made of linen,² like that of the Milesians and Ephesians, instead of the more sober costume and woollen clothing which he subsequently copied from Sparta and Peloponnesus—a time too when the Ionic name had not yet contracted that stain of effeminacy and cowardice which stood imprinted upon it in the time of Herodotus and Thucydidês, and which grew partly out of the subjugation of the Asiatic Ionians by Persia, partly out of the antipathy of the Peloponnesian Dorians to Athens. The author of the Homeric hymn, in describing the proud Ionians who thronged in his day to the Delian festival, could hardly have anticipated a time to come when the name *Ionian* would become a reproach, such as the European Greeks, to whom it really belonged, were desirous of disclaiming.³

Its decline
about 560 B.C.
—causes
thereof.

Homeric
hymn to
the Delian
Apollo—evi-
dence as to
early Ionic
life.

¹ Thucyd. iii. 104.

² Thucyd. i. 6. διὰ τὸ ἄβροδίατον, &c.

³ Herodot. i. 143. Οἱ μὲν νυν Ἕλλοι
ἴωνες καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐφυγον τὸ οὐνομα,
οὐ βουλευμένοι ἴωνες κεκληῖσθαι—an as-
sertion unquestionable with reference to

the times immediately preceding Hero-
dotus, but not equally admissible in re-
gard to the earlier times. Compare
Thucyd. i. 124 (with the Scholium), and
also v. 9; viii. 25.

2. Another illustrative fact in reference both to the Ionians generally, and to Chalkis and Eretria in particular, during the century anterior to Peisistratus,—is to be found in the war between these two cities respecting the fertile plain Lelantum which lay between them. In general, it appears, these two important towns maintained harmonious relations. But there were some occasions of dispute, and one in particular, wherein a formidable war ensued between them, several allies joining with each. It is remarkable that this was the only war known to Thucydidês, (anterior to the Persian conquest,) which had risen above the dignity of a mere quarrel between neighbours; and in which so many different states manifested a disposition to interfere, as to impart to it a semi-Hellenic character.¹ Respecting the allies of each party on this occasion we know only, that the Milesians lent assistance to Eretria, and the Samians, as well as the Thessalians and the Chalkidic colonies in Thrace, to Chalkis. A column, still visible during the time of Strabo in the temple of the Amarynthian Artemis near Eretria, recorded the covenant entered into mutually by the two belligerents, to abstain from missiles, and to employ nothing but hand-weapons. The Eretrians are said to have been superior in horse, but they were vanquished in the battle: the tomb of Kleomachus of Pharsalus, a distinguished warrior who had perished in the cause of the Chalkidians, was erected in the agora of Chalkis. We know nothing of the date, the duration, or the particulars of this war;² but it seems that the Eretrians were worsted, though their city always maintained its dignity as the second state in the island. Chalkis was decidedly the first, and continued to be flourishing, populous and commercial, long after it had lost its political importance, throughout all the period of Grecian independent history.³

¹ Thucyd. i. 15. The second Messenian war cannot have appeared to Thucydidês as having enlisted so many allies on each side as Pausanias represents.

² Strabo, viii. p. 448; Herodot. v. 99; Plutarch, Amator. p. 760—valuable by the reference to Aristotle.

Hesiod passed over from Askra to Chalkis, (on the occasion of the funeral games celebrated by the sons of Amphidamas in honour of their deceased father,) and gained a tripod as prize by his song or recital (Opp. Di. 656). According to the Scholia, Amphidamas was king of Chalkis, who perished in the war against

Eretria respecting Lelantum. But it appears that Plutarch threw out the lines as spurious, though he acknowledges Amphidamas as a vigorous champion of Chalkis in this war. See Septem Sapient. Conviv. c. 10. p. 153.

This visit of Hesiod to Chalkis was represented as the scene of his poetical competition with and victory over Homer (see the Certamen Hom. et Hes. p. 315, ed. Gottl.).

³ See the striking description of Chalkis given by Dikæarchus in the *Bios 'Ελληνικός* (Fragment. p. 146, ed. Fuhr).

3. Of the importance of Chalkis and Eretria, during the seventh and part of the eighth century before the Christian æra, we gather other evidences—partly in the numerous colonies founded by them (to which I shall advert in a subsequent chapter),—partly in the prevalence throughout a large portion of Greece, of the Euboic scale of weight and money. What the quantities and proportions of this scale were, has been first shown by M. Boeckh in his ‘Metrologie.’ It was of Eastern origin, and the gold collected by Dareius in tribute throughout the vast Persian empire was ordered to be delivered in Euboic talents. Its divisions—the talent equal to 60 minæ, the mina equal to 100 drachms, the drachm equal to 6 obols—were the same as those of the scale called Æginæan, introduced by Pheidôn of Argos. But the six obols of the Euboic drachm contained a weight of silver equal only to five Æginæan obols, so that the Euboic denominations—drachm, mina, and talent—were equal only to five-sixths of the same denominations in the Æginæan scale. It was the Euboic scale which prevailed at Athens before the debasement introduced by Solon; which debasement (amounting to about 27 per cent., as has been mentioned in a previous chapter,) created a third scale called the Attic, distinct both from the Æginæan and Euboic—standing to the former in the ratio of 3 : 5, and to the latter in the ratio of 18 : 25. It seems plain that the Euboic scale was adopted by the Ionians through their intercourse with the Lydians¹ and other Asiatics, and that it became naturalised among their cities under the name of the Euboic, because Chalkis and Eretria were the most actively commercial states in the Ægean—just as the superior commerce of Ægina, among the Dorian states, had given to the scale introduced by Pheidôn of Argos the name of Æginæan. The fact of its being so called indicates a time when these two Eubœan cities surpassed Athens in maritime power and extended commercial relations, and when they stood among the foremost of the Ionic cities throughout Greece. The Euboic scale, after having been debased by Solon in reference to coinage and money, still continued in use at Athens for merchandise. The Attic mercantile mina retained its primitive Euboic weight.²

Commerce and colonies of Chalkis and Eretria—Euboic scale of money and weight.

Three different Grecian scales—Æginæan, Euboic, and Attic—their ratio to each other.

¹ Herodot. i. 94.

² See Boeckh’s *Metrologie*, c. 8 and 9.

CHAPTER XIII.

ASIATIC IONIANS.

THERE existed at the commencement of historical Greece in 776 B.C., besides the Ionians in Attica and the Cyclades, twelve
Twelve Ionic cities in Asia. Ionian cities of note on or near the coast of Asia Minor, besides a few others less important. Enumerated from south to north, they stand—Milêtus, Myûs, Priênê, Samos, Ephesus, Kolophôn, Lebedus, Teôs, Erythræ, Chios, Klazomenæ, Phôkæa.

That these cities, the great ornament of the Ionic name, were founded by emigrants from European Greece, there is no reason to doubt. How or when they were founded, we have no history to tell us: the legend, which has already been set forth in a preceding chapter, gives us a great event called the
Legendary event called the Ionic migration. Ionic migration, referred by chronologists to one special year, 140 years after the Trojan war. This massive grouping belongs to the character of legend. The Æolic and Ionic emigrations, as well as the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, are each invested with unity and imprinted upon the imagination as the results of a single great impulse. But such is not the character of the historical colonies: when we come to relate the Italian and Sicilian emigrations, it will appear that each colony has its own separate nativity and causes of existence. In the case of the Ionic emigration, this large scale of legendary conception is more than usually conspicuous, since to that event is ascribed the foundation or re-peopling both of the Cyclades and of the Asiatic Ionian cities.

Euripidês treats Ion,¹ the son of Kreusa by Apollo, as the planter of these latter cities. But the more current form of the legend assigns that honour to the sons of Kodrus, two of whom are especially named, corresponding to the two greatest of the ten continental Ionic cities: Androklos as founder of Ephesus, Neileus of Milêtus. These two towns are both described as founded directly from Athens. The others seem rather to be separate settlements, neither consisting of Athe-

Emigrants to these cities — diverse Greeks.

¹ Euripid. Ion, 1546. κτίστωρ Ἀσίδδος χθονός.

nians, nor emanating from Athens, but adopting the characteristic Ionic festival of the Apaturia and (in part at least) the Ionic tribes—and receiving princes from the Kodrid families at Ephesus or Milêtus, as a condition of being admitted into the Pan-Ionic confederate festival. The poet Mimnermus ascribed the foundation of his native city Kolophôn to emigrants from Pylus in Peloponnesus, under Andramôn: Teôs was settled by Minyæ of Orchomenus, under Athamas: Klazomenæ by settlers from Kleônæ and Phlius, Phôkæa by Phokians, Priênê in large portion by Kadmeians from Thebes. And with regard to the powerful islands of Chios and Samos, it does not appear that their native authors—the Chian poet Ion or the Samian poet Asius—ascribed to them a population emanating from Athens. Nor could Pausanias make out from the poems of Ion how it happened that Chios came to form a part of the Ionic federation.¹ Herodotus especially dwells upon the number of Grecian tribes and races who contributed to supply the population of the twelve Ionic cities—Minyæ from Orchomenus, Kadmeians, Dryopians, Phokians, Molossians, Arkadian Pelasgians, Dorians from Epidaurus, and “several other sections” of Greeks. Moreover he particularly singles out the Milesians, as claiming for themselves the truest Ionic blood, and as having started from the Prytaneium at Athens; thus plainly implying his belief that the majority at least of the remaining settlers did not take their departure from the same hearth.²

¹ Pausan. vii. 4, 6. Τοσαῦτα εἰρηκότα ἐς Χίους Ἴωνα εὐρίσκω· οὐ μόντοι ἐκείνους γε εἴρηκε, καθ' ἥτινα αἰτίαν Χίοι τελοῦσιν ἐς Ἴωνας.

Respecting Samos, and its primitive Karian inhabitants, displaced by Patroklês and Tembrîon at the head of Grecian emigrants, see Etymol. Mag. v. Ἀστυπάλαια.

² Herodot. i. 146. ἐπεὶ, ὥς γε ἔτι μάλλον οὔτοι (i. e. the inhabitants of the Pan-Ionic Dodekapolis) Ἰωνεῖς εἰσι τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων, ἣ κάλλιον τι γεγόνουσι, μωρὴ πολλὴ λέγειν τῶν Ἀβαντες ἐξ Εὐβοίης εἰσὶν οὐκ ἐλαχίστη μοῖρα, τοῖσι Ἰωνίης μέτα οὐδὲ τοῦ δνόματος οὐδέν· Μίνναι δὲ Ὀρχομένιοι ἀναμεμίχεται, καὶ Καδμεῖοι, καὶ Δρύοπες, καὶ Φωκέες ἀποδάσμοι, καὶ Μολοσσοί, καὶ Ἀρκάδες Πελασγοί, καὶ Δωριεῖς Ἐπιδαυριοί, ἄλλα τε ἔθνηα πολλὰ ἀναμεμίχεται. Οἱ δὲ αὐτέων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πρυτανείου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὀρμηθέντες, καὶ νομίζοντες γενναϊότατοι εἶναι Ἰώνων, οὔτοι δὲ οὐ γυναῖκας ἡγαγον εἰς

ἀποικίην, ἀλλὰ Καεῖρας ἔσχον, τῶν ἐφένυσαν τοὺς γονεὺς . . . Ταῦτα δὲ ἦν γινόμενα ἐν Μιλήτῳ.

The polemical tone, in which this remark of Herodotus is delivered, is explained by Dahlmann on the supposition that it was destined to confute certain boastful pretensions of the Milesian Hekataeus (see Bähr, *ad loc.*, and Klausen *ad Hekataei Frag.* 225).

The test of *Ionism*, according to the statement of Herodotus, in, that a city should derive its origin from Athens, and that it should celebrate the solemnity of the Apaturia (i. 147). But we must construe both these tests with indulgence. Ephesus and Kolophôn were Ionic, though neither of them celebrated the Apaturia. And the colony might be formed under the auspices of Athens, though the settlers were neither natives, nor even of kindred race with the natives, of Attica.

But the most striking information which Herodotus conveys to us is, the difference of language or dialect which marked these twelve cities. *Milêtus*, *Myûs* and *Priênê*, all situated on the soil of the *Karians*, had one dialect: *Ephesus*, *Kolophôn*, *Lebedus*, *Teôs*, *Klazomenæ* and *Phôkæa*, had a dialect common to all, but distinct from that of the three preceding: *Chios* and *Erythræ* exhibited a third dialect, and *Samos* by itself a fourth. The historian does not content himself with simply noting such quadruple variety of speech; he employs very strong terms to express the degree of dissimilarity.¹ The testimony of Herodotus as to these dialects is of course indisputable.

Instead of one great *Ionic* emigration, then, the statements above-cited conduct us rather to the supposition of many separate and successive settlements, formed by Greeks of different sections, mingling with and modified by pre-existing *Lydians* and *Karians*, and subsequently allying themselves with *Milêtus* and *Ephesus* into the so-called *Ionic Amphiktyony*. As a condition of this union, they are induced to adopt among their chiefs, princes of the *Kodrid* gens or family; who are called sons of *Kodrus*, but who are not for that reason to be supposed necessarily contemporary with *Androklos* or *Neileus*.

The chiefs selected by some of the cities are said to have been *Lykians*,² of the heroic family of *Glaukus* and *Bellerophon*: there were other cities wherein the *Kodrids* and the *Glaukids* were chiefs conjointly. Respecting the dates of these separate settlements, we cannot give any account, for they lie beyond the commencement of authentic history. We see some ground for believing that most of them existed for some time previous to 776 B.C., but at what date the federative solemnity uniting the twelve cities was commenced, we do not know.

The account of Herodotus shows us that these colonies were composed of mixed sections of Greeks,—an important circumstance in estimating their character. Such was usually the case more or less in respect to all emigrations. Hence the establishments thus planted contracted at once, generally speaking, both more activity and more instability than was seen among those Greeks who remained at home, among whom the old habitual routine had

¹ Herod. i. 142. *Ephesus*, *Kolophôn*, *Lebedus*, *Teôs*, *Klazomenæ*, *Phokæa*—*ἀμολογέουσι κατὰ γλῶσσαν οὐδὲν, σφί δὲ ἁμοφωνέουσι.*
αὗται αἱ πόλεις τῇσι πρότερον λεχθείησι

² Herodot. i. 146.

not been counterworked by any marked change of place or of social relations. For in a new colony it became necessary to alter the classification of the citizens, to range them together in fresh military and civil divisions, and to adopt new characteristic sacrifices and religious ceremonies as bonds of union among all the citizens conjointly. At the first outset of a colony, moreover, there were inevitable difficulties to be surmounted which imposed upon its leading men the necessity of energy and forethought—more especially in regard to maritime affairs, on which not only their connexion with the countrymen whom they had left behind, but also their means of establishing advantageous relations with the population of the interior, depended. At the same time, the new arrangements indispensable among the colonists were far from working always harmoniously: dissension and partial secessions were not unfrequent occurrences. And what has been called the mobility of the Ionic race, as compared with the Doric, is to be ascribed in a great measure to this mixture of races and external stimulus arising out of expatriation. For there is no trace of it in Attica anterior to Solon; while on the other hand, the Doric colonies of Korkyra and Syracuse exhibit a population not less excitable than the Ionic towns generally,¹ and much more so than the Ionic colony of Massalia. The remarkable commercial enterprise, which will be seen to characterise Milêtus, Samos and Phokæa, belongs but little to anything connected with the Ionic temperament.

Mobility ascribed to the Ionic race as compared with the Doric—arises from this cause.

All the Ionic towns, except Klazomenæ and Phokæa, are represented to have been founded on some pre-existing settlements of Karians, Lelegians, Kretans, Lydians, or Pelasgians.² In some cases these previous inhabitants were overcome, slain, or expelled; in others they were accepted as fellow-residents, so that the Grecian cities, thus established, acquired a considerable tinge of Asiatic customs and feelings. What is related by Herodotus respecting the first establishment of Neileus and his emigrants at Milêtus is in this point of view remarkable. They took out with them no women from Athens (the historian says), but found wives in the Karian women of the place, whose husbands and fathers they overcame and put to death; and the women, thus violently seized, manifested their repugnance by taking a solemn oath among themselves that they

Ionic cities in Asia—mixed with indigenous inhabitants.

¹ Thucyd. vi. 17, about the Sicilian Greeks—ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ξυμμικτοῖς πολυ-
ανδρῶσιν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ βαδίας ἔχουσι τῶν

πολιτειῶν τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ ἐπιδοχάς.

² See Raoul Rochette, Histoire des Colonies Grecques, b. iv. c. 10. p. 93.

would never eat with their new husbands, nor ever call them by their personal names. This same pledge they imposed upon their daughters; but how long the practice lasted we are not informed. We may suspect from the language of the historian that traces of it were visible even in his day, in the family customs of the Milesians. The population of this greatest of the Ionic towns must thus have been half of Karian breed. It is to be presumed that what is true of Neileus and his companions would be found true also respecting most of the maritime colonies of Greece, and that the vessels which took them out would be scantily provided with women. But on this point unfortunately we are left without information.

The worship of Apollo Didymæus, at Branchidæ near Milêtus—that of Artemis, near Ephesus—and that of the Apollo Klarius, near Kolophôn—seems to have existed among the native Asiatic population before the establishment of either of these three cities. To maintain such pre-existing local rights was not less congenial to the feelings than beneficial to the interests, of the Greeks. All the three establishments acquired increased celebrity under Ionic administration, contributing in their turn to the prosperity of the towns to which they were attached. Milêtus, Myûs, and Priênê were situated on or near the productive plain of the river Mæander; while Ephesus was in like manner planted near the mouth of the Kaïster, thus immediately communicating with the productive breadth of land separating Mount Tmôlus on the north from Mount Messôgis on the south, through which that river runs: Kolophôn is only a very few miles north of the same river. Possessing the best means of communication with the interior, these three towns seem to have thriven with greater rapidity than the rest; and they, together with the neighbouring island of Samos, constituted in early times the strength of the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony. The situation of the sacred precinct of Poseidôn (where this festival was celebrated), on the north side of the promontory of Mykalê, near Priênê, and between Ephesus and Milêtus, seems to show that these towns formed the primitive centre to which the other Ionian settlements became gradually aggregated. For it was by no means a central site with reference to all the twelve; so that Thalês of Milêtus—who at a subsequent period recommended a more intimate political union between the twelve Ionic towns, and the establishment of a common government to manage their collective

Worship of
Apollo and
Artemis -
existed on
the Asiatic
coast prior to
the Greek
immigrants
—adopted by
them.

Pan-Ionic
festival and
Amphikty-
ony on the
promontory
of Mykalê.

affairs—indicated Teôs,¹ and not Priênê, as the suitable place for it. Moreover it seems that the Pan-Ionic festival,² though still formally continued, had lost its importance before the time of Thucydîdês, and had become practically superseded by the festival of the Ephesia, near Ephesus, where the cities of Ionia found a more attractive place of meeting.

An island close adjoining to the coast, or an outlying tongue of land connected with the continent by a narrow isthmus, and presenting some hill sufficient for an acropolis, seem to have been considered as the most favourable situations for Grecian colonial settlement. To one or other of these descriptions most of the Ionic cities conform.³ The city of Milêtus at the height of its power had four separate harbours, formed probably by the aid of the island of Ladê and one or two islets which lay close off against it. The Karian or Kretan establishment, which the Ionic colonists found on their arrival and conquered, was situated on an eminence overhanging the sea, and became afterwards known by the name of Old Milêtus, at a time when the new Ionic town had been extended down to the water-side and rendered maritime.⁴ The territory of this important city seems to have comprehended both the southern promontory called Poseidium and the greater part of the northern promontory of Mykalê,⁵ reaching on both sides of the river Mæander. The inconsiderable town of Myus⁶ on the southern bank of the Mæander, an offset seemingly formed by the secession of some Milesian malcontents under a member of the Neleid gens named Kydrêlus, maintained for a long time its autonomy, but was at length absorbed into the larger unity of Milêtus; its swampy territory having been rendered uninhabitable by a plague of gnats. Priênê acquired an importance, greater than naturally belonged to

Situation of
Milêtus—of
the other
Ionic cities.

¹ Herodot. i. 170.

² Both Diodorus (xv. 49) and Dionysius of Halikarnassus (A. R. iv. 25) speak as if the convocation or festival had been formally transferred to Ephesus, in consequence of the insecurity of the meetings near Mykalê; Strabo on the contrary speaks of the Pan-Ionia as if they were still in his time celebrated in the original spot (xiv. p. 636-638) under the care of the Priênæans. The formal transfer is not probable: Thucydîdês (iii. 104) proves that in his time the festival of Ephesia was practically the Pan-Ionic rendezvous, though Herodotus does not seem to have conceived it as such. See

Guhl, Ephesiaca, part iii. p. 117; and K. F. Hermann, Gottesdienstliche Alterthümer der Griechen, c. 66. p. 343.

³ The site of Milêtus is best indicated by Arrian, i. 19-20; see that of Phôkæa, Erythræ, Myonnêsus, Klazomenæ, Kolophôn, Teôs (Strabo, xiv. p. 644-645; Pausan. vii. 3, 2; Livy, xxxvii. 27-31; Thucyd. viii. 31).

⁴ Strabo, xiv. p. 635.

⁵ Strabo, xiv. p. 633; Herod. ix. 97-99. Τὸ Ποσειδίων τῶν Μιλησίων. Strabo, xiv. p. 651.

⁶ Strabo, xiv. p. 636; Vitruvius, iv. 1; Polyæn. viii. 35.

it, by its immediate vicinity to the holy Pan-Ionic temple and its function of administering the sacred rites¹—a dignity which it probably was only permitted to enjoy in consequence of the jealousies of its greater neighbours Milêtus, Ephesus, and Samos.²

Territories
interspersed
with Asiatic
villages.

The territories of these Grecian cities seem to have been interspersed with Karian villages, probably in the condition of subjects.

Magnêsia on
the Mæander
—Magnêsia
on Mount
Sipylus.

It is rare to find a genuine Greek colony established at any distance from the sea; but the two Asiatic towns called Magnêsia form exceptions to this position—one situated on the south side of the Mæander, or rather on the river Lethæus, which runs into the Mæander; the other more northerly, adjoining to the Æolic Greeks, on the northern declivity of Mount Sipylus, and near to the plain of the river Hermus. The settlement of both these towns dates before the period of history. The tale³ which we read affirms them to be settlements from the Magnêtes in Thessaly, formed by emigrants who had first passed into Krête, under the orders of the Delphian oracle, and next into Asia, where they are said to have extricated the Ionic and Æolic colonists, then recently arrived, from a position of danger and calamity. By the side of this story, which can neither be verified nor contradicted, it is proper to mention the opinion of Niebuhr, that both these towns of Magnêsia are remnants of a primitive Pelasgic population, akin to, but not emigrants from, the Magnêtes of Thessaly—Pelasgians whom he supposes to have occupied both the valley of the Hermus and that of the Kaïster, anterior to the Æolic and Ionic migrations. In support of this opinion, it may be stated that there were towns bearing the Pelasgic name of Larissa, both near the Hermus and near the Mæander; Menekratês of Elæa considered the Pelasgians as having once occupied most part of that coast; and O. Müller even conceives the Tyrrhenians to have been Pelasgians from Tyrrha, a town in the interior of Lydia south of Tmôlus. The point is one upon which we have not sufficient evidence to advance beyond conjecture.⁴

¹ Strabo, xiv. p. 636–638.

² Thucyd. i. 116.

³ Conon, Narrat. 29; Strabo, xiv. p. 636–647.

The story in Parthenius about Leukippus, leader τῶν δεκατευθέντων ἐκ Φέρης ὑπ' Ἀδμήτρου, who came to the Ephesian territory and acquired possession of the place called Kretinæon by

the treachery of Leukophryê, daughter of Mandrolytos, whether truth or romance, is one of the notices of Thessalian migration into those parts (Parthen. Narrat. 6).

⁴ Strabo, xiii. p. 621. See Niebuhr, Kleine Historische Schriften, p. 371; O. Müller, Etrusker, Einleitung, ii. 5. p. 80. The evidence on which Müller's

Of the Ionic towns, with which our real knowledge of Asia Minor begins, Milêtus¹ was the most powerful. Its celebrity was derived not merely from its own wealth and population, but also from the extraordinary number of its colonies, established principally in the Propontis and Euxine, and amounting, as we are told by some authors, to not less than 75 or 80. Respecting these colonies I shall speak presently, in treating of the general colonial expansion of Greece during the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. : at present it is sufficient to notice, that the islands of Ikarus and Lerus,² not far from Samos and the Ionic coast generally, were among the places planted with Milesian settlers.

The colonization of Ephesus by Androklos appears to be connected with the Ionic occupation of Samos, so far as the confused statements which we find enable us to discern. Androklos is said to have lingered upon that island for a long time, until the oracle vouchsafed to indicate to him what particular spot to occupy on the continent. At length, the indication being given, he planted his colonists at the fountain of Hypelæon and on a portion of the hill of Korêssus, within a short distance of the temple and sanctuary of Artemis; whose immediate inhabitants he respected and received as brethren, while he drove away for the most part the surrounding Lelegians and Lydians. The population of the new town of Ephesus was divided into three tribes,—the pre-existing inhabitants, or Ephesians proper, the Bennians, and the Euônymeis, so named (we are told) from the deme Euonymus in Attica.³ So much did the power of Androklos increase, that he was enabled to conquer Samos, and to

Ephesus—
Androklos
the Ekist—
first settle-
ment and
distribution.

conjecture is built seems however unusually slender, and the identity of Tyrrhênos and Torrhêbos, or the supposed confusion of the one with the other, is in no way made out. Pelasgians are spoken of in Trallês and Aphrodisias as well as in Ninoë (Steph. Byz. v. Νινὴ), but this name seems destined to present nothing but problems and delusions.

Respecting Magnêsia on the Mæander, consult Aristot. ap. Athen. iv. p. 173, who calls the town a colony from Delphi. But the intermediate settlement of these colonists in Krête, or even the reality of any town called Magnêsia in Krête, appears very questionable: Plato's statement (Legg. iv. 702; xi. 919) can hardly be taken as any evidence. Compare O. Müller, History of the Dorians, book ii. ch. 3; Hoeckh,

Kreta, book iii. vol. ii. p. 413. Müller gives these "*Sagen*" too much in the style of real facts: the worship of Apollo at Magnêsia on the Mæander (Paus. x. 32, 4) cannot be thought to prove much, considering how extensively that god was worshipped along the Asiatic coast, from Lykia to Troas.

The great antiquity of this Grecian establishment was recognised in the time of the Roman emperors; see Inscription. No. 2910 in Boeckh, Corp. Ins.

¹ Ἰωνίης πρόσχημα (Herodot. v. 28).

² Strabo, xiv. p. 635. Ikarus or Ikaria however appears in later times as belonging to Samos and used only for pasture (Strabo, p. 639; x. p. 488).

³ Kreophylus ap. Athen. viii. p. 361; Ephor. Fragm. 32, ed. Marx; Stephan. Byz. v. Βέννα: see Guhl, Ephesiaca, p. 29.

expel from it the prince Leôgorus. Of the retiring Samians, a part are said to have gone to Samothrace and to have there established themselves; while another portion acquired possession of Marathêsium near Ephesus, on the adjoining continent of Asia Minor, from whence, after a short time, they recovered their island, compelling Androklys to return to Ephesus. It seems, however, that in the compromise and treaty which ensued, they yielded possession of Marathêsium to Androklys,¹ and confined themselves to Anæa, a more southerly district farther removed from the Ephesian settlement, and immediately opposite to the island of Samos. Androklys is said to have perished in a battle fought for the defence of Priênê, which town he had come to aid against an attack of the Karians. His dead body was brought from the field and buried near the gates of Ephesus, where the tomb was yet shown during the days of Pausanias. But a sedition broke out against his sons after him, and the malcontents strengthened their party by inviting reinforcements from Teôs and Karina. The struggle which ensued terminated in the discontinuance of the kingly race and the establishment of a republican government—the descendants of Androklys being allowed to retain both considerable honorary privileges and the hereditary priesthood of the Eleusinian Dêmêtêr. The newly-received inhabitants were enrolled in two new tribes, making in all five tribes, which appear to have existed throughout the historical times at Ephesus.² It appears too that a certain number of fugitive proprietors from Samos found admission among the Ephesians and received the freedom of the city; and the part of the city in which they resided acquired the name of Samorna or Smyrna, by which name it was still known in the time of the satirical poet Hippônax, about 530 B.C.³

Such are the stories which we find respecting the infancy of the Ionic Ephesus. The fact of its increase and of its considerable acquisitions of territory, at the expense of the neighbouring Lydians,⁴ is at least indisputable. It does not appear to have been ever very powerful or enterprising at sea.

Increase and
acquisitions
of Ephesus.

¹ Pausan. vii. 4, 3.

² The account of Ephorus ap. Steph. Byz. v. *Βέννα*, attests at least the existence of the five tribes at Ephesus, whether his account of their origin and primitive history be well-founded or not. See also Strabo, xiv. p. 633; Steph. Byz. v. *Εὐωνυμία*. Karênê or Karinê is in Æolis, near Pitana and

Gryneium (Herod. vii. 42; Steph. Byz. *Καρήνη*).

³ Stephan. Byz. v. *Σάμωρνα*; Hesych. *Σαμωρία*; Athenæus, vi. p. 267; Hippônax, Fragm. 32, Schneid.; Strabo, xiv. p. 633. Some however said that the *vîcus* of Ephesus, called Smyrna, derived its name from an Amazon.

⁴ Strabo, xiv. p. 620.

Few maritime colonies owed their origin to its citizens. But its situation near the mouth and the fertile plain of the Kaïster was favourable both to the multiplication of its inland dependencies and to its trade with the interior. A despot named Pythagoras is said to have subverted by stratagem the previous government of the town, at some period before Cyrus, and to have exercised power for a certain time with great cruelty.¹ It is worthy of remark, that we find no trace of the existence of the four Ionic tribes at Ephesus; and this, when coupled with the fact that neither Ephesus nor Kolophôn solemnised the peculiar Ionic festival of the Apaturia, is one among other indications that the Ephesian population had little community of race with Athens, though the Ækist may have been of heroic Athenian family. Guhl attempts to show, on mistaken grounds, that the Greek settlers at Ephesus were mostly of Arkadian origin.²

Kolophôn—about fifteen miles north of Ephesus, and divided from the territory of the latter by the precipitous mountain range called Gallêsium—though a member of the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony, seems to have had no Ionic origin. It recognised neither an Athenian Ækist nor Athenian inhabitants. The Kolophonian poet Mimnermus tells us that the Ækist of the place was the Pylian Andræmôn, and that the settlers were Pylians from Peloponnesus. “We quitted (he says) Pylus, the city of Neleus, and passed in our vessels to the much-desired Asia. There, with the insolence of superior force, and employing from the beginning cruel violence, we planted ourselves in the tempting Kolophôn.”³ This description of the primitive Kolophonian settlers, given with Homeric simplicity, forcibly illustrates the account

¹ Bato ap. Suidas, v. Πυθαγόρας. In this article of Suidas, however, it is stated that “the Ephesian Pythagoras put down by means of a crafty plot the government of those who were called the *Basilidæ*.” Now Aristotle talks (Polit. v. 5, 4) of the oligarchy of the *Basilidæ* at Erythræ. It is hardly likely that there should have been an oligarchy called by that same name both at Erythræ and Ephesus: there is here some confusion between Erythræ and Ephesus which we are unable to clear up. Bato of Sinôpê wrote a book *περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τυράννων* (Athenæus, vii. p. 289).

² Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, cap. ii. s. 2. p. 28. The passage which he cites in Aristeidês (Or. xlii. p. 523) refers not to Ephesus, but to Pergamus, and to the

mythe of Augê and Têlephus: compare *ibid.* p. 251.

³ Mimnerm. Fragm. 9, Schneid. ap. Strab. xiv. p. 634:—

Ἡμεῖς δ' αἰπὸν Πύλον Νηλῆϊον ἄστῳ λιπόντες
Ἰμερτὴν Ἀσίην νηυσὶν ἀφικόμεθα
Ἐς δ' ἐρατὴν Κολοφῶνα, βίην ὑπέρσπλον ἔχοντες,
Ἐξόμεθ' ἀργαλέης ὕβριος ἡγεμόνες.

Mimnermus, in his poem called *Nanno*, named Andræmôn as founder (Strabo, p. 633). Compare this behaviour with the narrative of Odysseus in Homer (*Odys.* ix. 40):—

Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος Κικόνεσσι πέλασεν
Ἰσμάρω' ἐνθα δ' ἐγὼ πόλιν ἔπραθον, ὤλεσα δ'
αὐτούς.

Ἐκ πόλιν δ' ἀλόχους καὶ κτήματα πολλὰ λα-
βόντες
Δάσσαμεθ', &c.

Mimnermus comes in point of time a little before Solon, B.C. 620-600.

given by Herodotus of the proceedings of Neileus at Milêtus. The establishment of Andræmôn must have been effected by force, and by the dispossession of previous inhabitants, leaving probably their wives and daughters as a prey to the victors. The city of Kolophôn seems to have been situated about two miles inland; having a fortified port called Notium, not joined to it by long walls as the Peiræus was to Athens, but completely distinct. There were times in which this port served the Kolophonians as a refuge, when their upper town was assailed by Persians from the interior. But the inhabitants of Notium occasionally manifested inclinations to act as a separate community, and dissensions thus occurred between them and the people in Kolophôn¹—so difficult was it in the Greek mind to keep up a permanent feeling of political amalgamation beyond the circle of the town walls.

It is much to be regretted that nothing beyond a few lines of Mimnermus, and nothing at all of the long poem of Xenophanês (composed seemingly near a century after Mimnermus) on the foundation of Kolophôn, has reached us. The short statements of Pausanias omit all notice of that violence which the native Kolophonian poet so emphatically signalizes in his ancestors. They are

Temple of
Apollo at
Klarus, near
Kolophôn—
its legends.

derived more from the temple legends of the adjoining Klarian Apollo, and from morsels of epic poetry referring to that holy place, which connected itself with the worship of Apollo in Krête, at Delphi, and at Thebes. The old Homeric poem, called Thebaïs, reported that Mantô, daughter of the Theban prophet Teiresias, had been presented to Apollo and Delphi as a votive offering by the victorious Epigoni: the god directed her to migrate to Asia, and she thus arrived at Klarus, where she married the Kretan Rhakius. The offspring of this marriage was the celebrated prophet Mopsus, whom the Hesiodic epic described as having gained a victory in prophetic skill over Kalchas; the latter having come to Klarus after the Trojan war in company with Amphilocheus son of Amphiaraus.² Such tales evince the early importance of the temple and oracle of Apollo at Klarus, which appears to have been in some sort an emanation from the great sanctuary of Branchidæ near Milêtus; for we are told that the high priest of Klarus was named by the Milesians.³ Pausanias states that Mopsus expelled the indigenous Karians,

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 2, 12; Thucyd. iii. 34. | poem called *Νόσται* (apud Düntzer),
Epic. Græc. Frag. p. 23; Pausan. ix.
² Hesiod. ap. Strab. xiv. p. 643; | 33, 1.
Conon, Narrat. 6; Argument of the | ³ Tacit. Annal. ii. 54.

and established the city of Kolophôn; and that the Ionic settlers under Promêthus and Damasichthôn, sons of Kodrus, were admitted amicably as additional inhabitants:¹ a story probably emanating from the temple, and very different from that of the Kolophonian townsmen in the time of Mimnermus. It seems evident that not only the Apollinic sanctuary at Klarus, but also the analogous establishments on the south of Asia Minor at Phasêlis, Mallus, &c., had their own foundation legends, (apart from those of the various bands of emigrant settlers,) in which they connected themselves by the best thread which they could devise with the epic glories of Greece.²

Passing along the Ionian coast in a north-westerly direction from Kolophôn, we come first to the small but independent Ionic settlement of Lebedus—next, to Teôs, Lebedus, Teôs, Klazomenæ, &c. which occupies the southern face of a narrow isthmus, Klazomenæ being placed on the northern. This isthmus, a low narrow valley of about six miles across, forms the eastern boundary of a very considerable peninsula, containing the mountainous and woody regions called Mimas and Kôrykus. Teôs is said to have been first founded by Orchomenian Minyæ under Athamas, and to have received afterwards by consent various swarms of settlers, Orchomenians and others, under the Kodrid leaders Apœkus, Nauklus and Damasus.³ The valuable Teian inscriptions published in the large collection of Boeckh, while they mention certain names and titles of honour which connect themselves with this Orchomenian origin, reveal to us some particulars respecting the internal distribution of the Teian citizens. The territory of the town was distributed amongst a certain number of towers, to each of which corresponded a symmory or section of the citizens, having its common altar and sacred rites, and often its heroic Eponymus. Internal distribution of the inhabitants of Teôs. How many in number the tribes of Teôs were, we do not know. The name of the Geleontes, one of the four old Ionic tribes, is preserved in an inscription; but the rest, both as to names and number, are unknown. The symmories or tower-fellowships of Teôs seem to be analogous to the phratries of ancient Athens—forming each a factitious kindred, recognising a common mythical ancestor, and bound together by a communion at once religious and political. The individual name attached to each tower is in some cases Asiatic rather than Hellenic, indicating

¹ Pausan. vii. 3, 1.

² See Welcker, *Epischer Kyklus*, p. 285.

³ Steph. Byz. v. *Téws*; Pausan. vii. 3, 3; Strabo, xiv. p. 633. Anakreon called the town Ἀθαμαντίδα Τέω (Strab. l. c.).

in Teôs the mixture not merely of Ionic and Æolic, but also of Karian or Lydian inhabitants, of which Pausanias speaks.¹ Gerrhæidæ or Cherræidæ, the port on the west side of the town of Teôs, had for its eponymous hero Gerês the Bœotian, who was said to have accompanied the Kodrids in their settlement.

The worship of Athênê Polias at Erythræ may probably be traceable to Athens, and that of the Tyrian Hêraklês (of which Pausanias recounts a singular legend) would seem to indicate an intermixture of Phœnician inhabitants. But the close neighbourhood of Erythræ to the island of Chios, and the marked analogy of dialect which Herodotus² attests between them, show that the elements of the population must have been

¹ Pausan. vii. 3, 3. See the Inscript. No. 3064 in Boeckh's Corp. Ins., which enumerates twenty-eight separate *πύργοι*. It is a list of archons, with the name and civil designation of each: I do not observe that the name of the same *πύργος* ever occurs twice—*Ἀρτέμων, τοῦ Φιλαίου πύργου, Φιλαΐδης, &c.*: there are two *πύργοι*, the names of which are effaced on the inscription. In two other inscriptions (Nos. 3065, 3066) there occur *Ἐχίνου συμμορία*—*Ἐχίναδαι*—as the title of a civil division without any specification of an *Ἐχίνου πύργος*; but it is reasonable to presume that the *πύργος* and the *συμμορία* are coincident divisions. The *Φιλαίου πύργος* occurs also in another Inscr. No. 3081. Philæus is the Athenian hero, son of Ajax, and eponym of the deme or gens Philaidæ in Attica, who existed, as we here see, in Teôs also. In Inscription, No. 3082, a citizen is complimented as *νέον Ἀθάμαντα*, after the name of the old Minyan hero. In No. 3078, the Ionic tribe of the *Γελέοντες* is named as existing at Teôs.

Among the titles of the towers we find the following—*τοῦ Κίδου πύργου, τοῦ Κινάβαλου πύργου, τοῦ Ἱέρους πύργου, τοῦ Δάδδου πύργου, τοῦ Σίντους πύργου*: these names seem to be rather foreign than Hellenic. *Κίδος, Ἱέρους, Σίντους, Δάδδος*, are Asiatic, perhaps Karian or Lydian: respecting the name *Δάδδος*, compare Steph. Byz. v. *Τρέμισσος*, where *Δάδας* appears as a Karian name: Boeckh (p. 651) expresses his opinion that *Δάδδος* is Karian or Lydian. Then *Κινάβαλος* seems plainly not Hellenic: it is rather Phœnician (Annibal, Asdrubal, &c.), though Boeckh (in his Introductory Comment to the

Sarmatian Inscriptions, Part xi. p. 109) tells us that *βαλος* is also Thracian or Getic—"βαλος haud dubie Thracica aut Getica est radix finalis, quam tenes in Dacico nomine Decebalus, et in nomine populi Triballorum." The name *τοῦ Κόθου πύργου, Κοθίδης*, is Ionic: *Æklus* and *Kothus* are represented as Ionic cœists in Eubœa. Another name—*Πάρμις, τοῦ Σθενέλου πύργου, Χαλκιδεῖος*—affords an instance in which the local or gentile epithet is not derived from the tower; for *Χαλκιδεῖς* or *Χαλκιδεύς* was the denomination of a village in the Teian territory. In regard to some persons, the gentile epithet is derived from the tower—*τοῦ Φιλαίου πύργου, Φιλαΐδης—τοῦ Γαλαΐσου πύργου, Γαλασιδίδης—τοῦ Δάδδου πύργου, Δαδδεῖος—τοῦ πύργου τοῦ Κιζῶνος, Κίζων*: in other cases not—*τοῦ Ἐκαδίου πύργου, Σκηβητίδης—τοῦ Μηράδου πύργου, Βρυσκίδης—τοῦ Ἰσθμίου πύργου, Λεωνίδης, &c.* In the Inscr. 3065, 3066, there is a formal vote of the *Ἐχίνου συμμορία* or *Ἐχίναδαι* (both names occur). Mention is also made of the *βῶμος τῆς συμμορίας*, and of the annual solemnity called *Leukatheia*, seemingly a gentile solemnity of the Echinadæ, which connects itself with the mythical family of Athamas. As an analogy to these Teian towers, we may compare the *πύργοι* in the Euxine (Boeckh, Insc. 2058), *πύργος Πόσιος, πύργος Ἐπιδάουρου*—they were portions of the fortifications. See also Dio Chrysostom, Orat. xxxvi. p. 76-77. A large tower, belonging to a private individual named Aglomachus, is mentioned in Kyrênê (Herod. iv. 164).

² Herod. i. 142: compare Thucyd. viii. 5.

much the same in both. The Chian poet Iôn mentioned the establishment of Abantes from Eubœa in his native island, under Amphiklus, intermixed with the pre-existing Karians. Hektor, the fourth descendant from Amphiklus, was said to have incorporated this island in the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony. It is to Pherekydês that we owe the mention of the name of Egertius, as having conducted a miscellaneous colony into Chios; and it is through Egertius (though Iôn, the native poet, does not appear to have noticed him) that this logographer made out the connexion between the Chians and the other group of Kodrid settlements.¹ In Erythræ, Knôpus or Kleopus is noted as the Kodrid Œkist, and as having procured for himself, partly by force, partly by consent, the sovereignty of the pre-existing settlement of mixed inhabitants. The Erythræan historian Hippias recounted how Knôpus had been treacherously put to death on shipboard, by Ortygês and some other false adherents; who, obtaining some auxiliaries from the Chian king Amphiklus, made themselves masters of Erythræ and established in it an oppressive oligarchy. They maintained the government, with a temper at once licentious and cruel, for some time, admitting none but a chosen few of the population within the walls of the town; until at length Hippotês the brother of Knôpus, arriving from without at the head of some troops, found sufficient support from the discontents of the Erythræans to enable him to overthrow the tyranny. Overpowered in the midst of a public festival, Ortygês and his companions were put to death with cruel tortures. The like tortures were inflicted upon their innocent wives and children²—a degree of cruelty which would at no time have found place amidst a community of European Greeks: even in the murderous party dissensions of Korkyra during the Peloponnesian war, death was not aggravated by preliminary tortures. Aristotle³ mentions the oligarchy of the Basilids as having existed in Erythræ, and as having been overthrown by a democratical revolution, although prudently managed. To what period this is to be referred we do not know.

Klazomenæ is said to have been founded by a wandering party, either of Ionians or of inhabitants from Kleonæ and Phlius, under Parphorus or Paralus; and Phôkæa by a

Klazomena
—Phôkæa.

¹ Strabo, xiv. p. 633.

² Hippias ap. Athen. vi. p. 259; Polyæn. viii. 44, gives another story about Knôpus. Erythræ, called Κνωπούπολις (Steph. Byz. v.).

The story told by Polyænus about the dictum of the oracle, and the con-

sequent stratagem, whereby Knôpus made himself master of Erythræ, represents that town as powerful anterior to the Ionic occupation (Polyæn. viii. 43).

³ Aristot. Polit. v. 5, 4.

band of Phokians under Philogenês and Damon. This last-mentioned town was built at the end of a peninsula which formed part of the territory of the Æolic Kymê: the Kymæans were induced to cede it amicably, and to permit the building of the new town. The Phokians asked and obtained permission to enrol themselves in the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony; but the permission is said to have been granted only on condition that they should adopt members of the Kodrid family as their Ækists; and they accordingly invited from Erythræ and Teôs three chiefs belonging to that family or gens—Decetês, Periklus, and Abartus.¹

Smyrna, originally an Æolic colony, established from Kymê, fell subsequently into the hands of the Ionians of Kolophôn.

Smyrna. A party of exiles from the latter city, expelled during an intestine dispute, were admitted by the Smyrnæans into their city—a favour which they repaid by shutting the gates and seizing the place for themselves, at a moment when the Smyrnæans had gone forth in a body to celebrate a religious festival. The other Æolic towns sent auxiliaries for the purpose of re-establishing their dispossessed brethren; but they were compelled to submit to an accommodation whereby the Ionians retained possession of the town, restoring to the prior inhabitants all their moveables. These exiles were distributed as citizens among the other Æolic cities.²

Smyrna after this became wholly Ionian; and the inhabitants in later times, if we may judge by Aristeidês the rhetor, appear to have forgotten the Æolic origin of their town, though the fact is attested both by Herodotus and by Mimnermus.³ At what time the change took place we do not know; but Smyrna appears to have become Ionian before the celebration of the twenty-third Olympiad (B.C. 688), when Onomastus the Smyrnæan gained the prize.⁴ Nor have we information as to the period at which the city was received as a member into the Pan-Ionic Amphiktyony; for the assertion of Vitruvius is obviously inadmissible, that it was admitted at the instance of Attalus king of Pergamus, in place of a previous town called Melitê, excluded by the rest for misbehaviour.⁵ As little can we credit the statement of Strabo, that the city of Smyrna was destroyed by the Lydian kings, and that

¹ Pausan. vii. 3, 3. In Pausanias the name stands *Abartus*; but it probably ought to be *Abarnus*, the Eponymus of Cape Abarnis in the Phôkæan territory: see Stephan. Byz. v. Ἀβαρνίς. Raoul Rochette puts Abarnus without making any remark (*Histoire des Colonies Grecques*, b. iv. c. 13. p. 95).

² Herod. i. 150; Mimnermus, *Fragm.*—

Θεῶν βουλῇ Σμύρνην εἰλομαι Αἰολίδα.

³ See Raoul Rochette, *Histoire des Colonies Grecques*, b. iv. ch. 5. p. 43; Aristeidês, *Orat.* xx.-xxi. pp. 260, 267.

⁴ Pausan. v. 8, 3.

⁵ Vitruvius, iv. 1.

the inhabitants were compelled to live in dispersed villages until its restoration by Antigonos. A fragment of Pindar, which speaks of "the elegant city of the Smyrnæans," indicates that it must have existed in his time.¹ The town of Eræ, near Lebedus, though seemingly autonomous,² was not among the contributors to the Pan-Ionion; Myonnêsus seems to have been a dependency of Têos, as Pygela and Marathêsium were of Ephesus. Notium, after its re-colonization by the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war, seems to have remained separate from and independent of Kolophôn: at least the two are noticed by Skylax as distinct towns.³

¹ Strabo, xiv. p. 646; Pindar, Frag. 155, Dissen.

² Thucyd. viii. 19.

³ Skylax, c. 97; Thucyd. iii. 34.

CHAPTER XIV.

ÆOLIC GREEKS IN ASIA.

ON the coast of Asia Minor to the north of the twelve Ionic confederated cities, were situated the twelve Æolic cities, Twelve cities of Æolic Greeks. apparently united in a similar manner. Besides Smyrna, the fate of which has already been described, the eleven others were—Têmnos, Larissa, Neon-Teichos, Kymê, Ægæ, Myrina, Gryneium, Killa, Notium, Ægiroëssa, Pitânê. These twelve are especially noted by Herodotus, as the twelve ancient continental Æolic cities, and distinguished on the one hand from the insular Æolic Greeks, in Lesbos, Tenedos, and Hekatonnesoi—and on the other hand from the Æolic establishments in and about Mount Ida, which seem to have been subsequently formed and derived from Lesbos and Kymê.¹

Of these twelve Æolic towns, eleven were situated very near together, clustered round the Elæitic Gulf: their territories, all of moderate extent, seem also to have been Their situation—eleven near together on the Elæitic Gulf. conterminous with each other. Smyrna, the twelfth, was situated to the south of Mount Sipylus, and at a greater distance from the remainder—one reason why it was so soon lost to its primitive inhabitants. These towns occupied chiefly a narrow but fertile strip of territory lying between the base of the woody mountain-range called Sardênê and the sea.² Gryneium, like Kolophôn and Milêtus, possessed a venerated sanctuary of Apollo, of older date than the Æolic immigration. Larissa, Têmnos, and Ægæ were at some little distance from the sea; the first at a short distance north of the Hermus, by which its territory was watered and occasionally inundated, so as to render embankments necessary;³ the last two upon rocky mountain-sites, so inaccessible to attack, that the inhabitants were enabled, even during the height of the Persian power, to maintain constantly a

¹ Herodot. i. 149. Herodotus does not name Elæa, at the mouth of the Kaïkus: on the other hand, no other

author mentions Ægiroëssa (see Man-
nert, Geogr. der Gr. und Römer, b. viii. p. 396).

² Herod. *ut sup.*; Pseudo-Herodot. Vit. Homerî, c. 9. Σαρδηνῆς πόδα
νείατον ὑψικόμοιο.

³ Strabo, xiii. p. 621.

substantial independence.¹ Elæa, situated at the mouth of the river Kaïkus, became in later times the port of the strong and flourishing city of Pergamus; while Pitana, the northernmost of the twelve, was placed between the mouth of the Kaïkus and the lofty promontory of Kanê, which closes in the Elæitic Gulf to the northward. A small town Kanæ close to that promontory is said to have once existed.²

It has already been stated that the legend ascribes the origin of these colonies to a certain special event called the Æolic emigration, of which chronologers profess to know the precise date, telling us how many years it happened after the Trojan war, considerably before the Ionic emigration.³ That the Æolic as well as the Ionic inhabitants of Asia were emigrants from Greece, we may reasonably believe, but as to the time or circumstances of their emigration we can pretend to no certain knowledge. The name of the town Larissa, and perhaps that of Magnêsia on Mount Sipylus (according to what has been observed in the preceding chapter), has given rise to the supposition that the anterior inhabitants were Pelasgians, who, having once occupied the fertile banks of the Hermus, as well as those of the Kaïster near Ephesus, employed their industry in the work of embankment.⁴ Kymê was the earliest as well as the most powerful of the twelve Æolic towns; Neon-Teichos having been originally established by the Kymæans as a fortress for the purpose of capturing the Pelasgic Larissa. Both Kymê and Larissa were designated by the epithet of Phri-

Legendary
Æolic migra-
tion.

Kymê—the
earliest as
well as the
most power-
ful of the
twelve.

¹ Xenoph. Hellen. iv. 8, 5. The rhetor Aristeidês (Orat. Sacr. xxvii. p. 347, p. 535 D.) describes in detail his journey from Smyrna to Pergamus, crossing the Hermus, and passing through Larissa, Kymê, Myrina, Gryneium, Elæa. He seems not to have passed through Têmnos, at least he does not name it: moreover we know from Pausanias (v. 13, 3) that Têmnos was on the north bank of the Hermus. In the best maps of this district it is placed, erroneously, both on the south bank, and as if it were on the high road from Smyrna to Kymê. We may infer from another passage of Aristeidês (Or. xlviii. p. 351, p. 468 D.) that Larissa was nearer to the mouth of the Hermus than the maps appear to place it. According to Strabo (xiii. p. 622), it would seem that Larissa was on the south bank of the Hermus; but the better testimony of

Aristeidês proves the contrary; Skylax (c. 94) does not name Têmnos, which seems to indicate that its territory was at some distance from the sea.

The investigations of modern travellers have as yet thrown little light upon the situation of Têmnos or of the other Æolic towns: see Arundel, Discoveries in Asia Minor, vol. ii. pp. 292–298.

² Pliny, H. N. v. 30

³ Strabo, xiii. pp. 582–621, compared with Pseudo-Herodotus, Vit. Homer, c. 1–38, who says that Lesbos was occupied by the Æolians 130 years after the Trojan war; Kymê, 20 years after Lesbos; Smyrna, 18 years after Kymê.

The chronological statements of different writers are collected in Mr. Clinton's Fast. Hellen. c. 5. pp. 104, 105.

⁴ Strabo, xiii. p. 621.

kônis. By some this was traced to the mountain Phrikium in Lokris, from whence it was alleged that the Æolic emigrants had started to cross the Ægean: by others it seems to have been connected with an eponymous hero Phrikôn.¹

It was probably from Kymê and its sister cities on the Elæitic Gulf that Hellenic inhabitants penetrated into the smaller towns in the inland plain of the Kaïkus—Pergamus, Halisarna, Gambreion, &c.² In the more southerly plain of the Hermus, on the northern declivity of Mount Sipylus, was situated the city of Magnêsia, called *Magnêsia ad Sipylum* in order to distinguish it from Magnêsia on the river Mæander. Both these towns called Magnêsia were inland—the one bordering upon the Ionic Greeks, the other upon the Æolic, but seemingly not included in any Amphiktyony either with the one or the other. Each is referred to a separate and early immigration either from the Magnêtes in Thessaly or from Krête. Like many other of the early towns, Magnêsia ad Sipylum appears to have been originally established higher up on the mountain—in a situation nearer to Smyrna, from which it was separated by the Sipylen range—and to have been subsequently brought down nearer to the plain on the north side as well as to the river Hermus. The original site, Palæ-Magnêsia,³ was still occupied as a dependent township, even during the times of the Attalid and Seleukid kings. A like transfer of situation, from a height difficult of access to some lower and more convenient position, took place with other towns in and near this region; such as Gambreion and Skêpsis, which had their Palæ-Gambreion and Palæ-Skêpsis not far distant.

Of these twelve Æolic towns, it appears that all except Kymê were small and unimportant. Thucydides, in recapitulating the dependent allies of Athens at the commencement of the Peloponnesian war, does not account them worthy of being enumerated.⁴ Nor are we authorized to conclude, because they bear the general name of Æolians, that the inhabitants were all of kindred race,

¹ Strabo, xiii. 621; Pseudo-Herodot. c. 14. *Λαοὶ Φρίκωνος*, compared with c. 38.

Φρίκων appears in later times as an Ætolian proper name; *Φρίκος* as a Lokrian. See *Anecdota Delphica* by E. Curtius, *Inscript.* 40. p. 75 (Berlin, 1843).

² Xenoph. *Hellen.* iii. 1, 6; *Anab.* vii. 8, 24.

³ There is a valuable inscription in Boeckh's collection, No. 3137, contain-

ing the convention between the inhabitants of Smyrna and Magnêsia. Palæ-Magnêsia seems to have been a strong and important post.

"Magnêtes a Sipylo," Tacit. *Annal.* ii. 47; Pliny, *H. N.* v. 29; Pausan. iii. 24, 2. *πρὸς βόρρην τοῦ Σιπύλου.*

Stephan. Byzantinus notices only Magnêsia ad Mæandrum, not Magnêsia ad Sipylum.

⁴ Thucyd. ii. 9.

though a large proportion of them are said to have been Bœotians, and the feeling of fraternity between Bœotians and Lesbians was maintained throughout the historical times. One etymology of the name is indeed founded upon the supposition that they were of miscellaneous origin.¹ We do not hear, moreover, of any considerable poets produced by the Æolic continental towns.

In this respect Lesbos stood alone—an island said to Lesbos. have been the earliest of all the Æolic settlements, anterior even to Kymê. Six towns were originally established in Lesbos—Mitylênê, Mêthymna, Eresus, Pyrrha, Antissa, and Arisbê: the last-mentioned town was subsequently enslaved and destroyed by the Methymnæans, so that there remained only five towns in all.² According to the political subdivision usual in Greece, the island had thus, first six, afterwards five, independent governments; of which, however, Mitylênê, situated in the south-eastern quarter and facing the promontory of Kanê, was by far the first—while Mêthymna, on the north of the island over against Cape Lekton, was the second. Like so many other Grecian colonies, the original city of Mitylênê was founded upon an islet divided from Lesbos by a narrow strait; it was subsequently extended on to Lesbos itself, so that the harbour presented two distinct entrances.³

It appears that the native poets and fabulists who professed to deliver the archæology of Lesbos, dwelt less upon the Æolic settlers than upon the various heroes and tribes who were alleged to have had possession of the island anterior to that settlement, from the deluge of Deukalion downwards,—just as the Early inhabitants of Lesbos before the Æolians. Chian and Samian poets seem to have dwelt principally upon the ante-Ionic antiquities of their respective islands. After the Pelasgian Xanthus son of Triopas, comes Makar son of Kri-nakus, the great native hero of the island, supposed by Plehn to be the eponym of an occupying race called the Makares. The Homeric hymn to Apollo brings Makar into connexion with the Æolic inhabitants, by calling him son of Æolus; and the native historian Myrsilus also seems to have treated him as an Æolian.⁴

¹ Strabo, ix. p. 402; Thucyd. viii. 100; Pseudo-Herodot. Vit. Homer. i. 'Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡ πάλαι Αἰολιῶτις Κῶμη ἐκτί-
ζετο, συνῆλθον ἐν ταύτῃ παντοδαπὰ ἔθνη
Ἑλληνικὰ, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐκ Μαγνησίας, &c.
Etymolog. Magn. v. Αἰολεῖς.

² Herodot. i. 151; Strabo, xiii. p. 590.

³ Diodor. xiii. 79; Strabo, xiii. p. 617; Thucyd. iii. 6.

⁴ Hymn. ad Apollin. v. 37. Λέσβος

τ' ἡγαθέη, Μάκαρος ἕδος Αἰολίωνος. Myr-
silus ap. Clemen. Alexandr. Protreptic.
p. 19; Diodor. v. 57-82; Dionys. Halik.
A. R. i. 18; Stephan. Byz. v. Μυτιλήνη.

Plehn (Lesbiaca, c. 2. pp. 25-37) has collected all the principal fables respecting this Lesbian archæology; compare also Raoul Rochette (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, t. i. c. 5. p. 182, &c.).

To dwell upon such narratives suited the disposition of the Greeks ; but when we come to inquire for the history of Lesbos, we find ourselves destitute of any genuine materials not only for the period prior to the Æolic occupation, but also for a long time after it : nor can we pretend to determine at what date that occupation took place. We may reasonably believe it to have occurred before 776 B.C., and it therefore becomes a part of the earliest manifestations of real Grecian history. Both Kymê, with its eleven sister towns on the continent, and the islands Lesbos and Tenedos, were then Æolic. I have already remarked that the migration of the father of Hesiod the poet, from the Æolic Kymê to Askra in Bœotia, is the earliest authentic fact known to us on contemporary testimony,—seemingly between 776 and 700 B.C.

But besides these islands, and the strip of the continent between Kymê and Pitanê (which constituted the territory properly called Æolis), there were many other Æolic establishments in the region near Mount Ida, the Troad, and the Hellespont, and even in European Thrace. All these establishments seem to have emanated from Lesbos, Kymê and Tenedos, but at what time they were formed we have no information. Thirty different towns are said to have been established by these cities,¹ from whence nearly all the region of Mount Ida (meaning by that term the territory west of a line drawn from the town of Adramyttion northward, to Priapos on the Propontis) came to be Æolised. A new Æolis² was thus formed, quite distinct from the Æolis near the Elæitic Gulf, and severed from it partly by the territory of Atarneus, partly by the portion of Mysia and Lydia, between Atarneus and Adramyttium, including the fertile plain of Thêbê. A portion of the lands on this coast seem indeed to have been occupied by Lesbos, but the far larger part of it was never Æolic. Nor was Ephorus accurate when he talked of the whole territory between Kymê and Abydos as known under the name of Æolis.³

The inhabitants of Tenedos possessed themselves of the strip of the Troad opposite to their island, northward of Cape Lekton—

¹ Strabo, xiii. pp. 621, 622. Μέγιστον δέ ἐστι τῶν Αἰολικῶν καὶ ἀρίστη Κύμη, καὶ σχεδὸν μητρόπολις αὐτῇ τε καὶ ἡ Λέσβος τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τριάκοντά πόντον ἀριθμὺν, &c.

² Xenophon, Hellen. iii. 1, 10. μέχρι τῆς Φαρναβάζου Αἰολίδος—ἡ Αἰολίς αὐτῇ ᾗν μὲν Φαρναβάζου.

Xenophon includes the whole of the Troad under the denomination of Æolis. Skylax distinguishes the Troad from

Æolis : he designates as the Troad the coast towns from Dardanus seemingly down to Lekton : under Æolis he includes Kebrên, Skêpsis, Neandreia and Pityeia, though how these four towns are to be called ἐπὶ θαλάσση it is not easy to see (Skylax, 94, 95). Nor does Skylax notice either the Peræa of Tenedos, or Assos and Gargara.

³ Strabo, xiii. p. 583.

those of Lesbos founded Assus, Gargara, Lampônia, Antandrus,¹ &c., between Lekton and the north-eastern corner of the Adramyttian Gulf—while the Kymæans seem to have established themselves at Kebrên and other places in the inland Idæan district.² As far as we can make out, this north-western corner (west of a line drawn from Smyrna to the eastern corner of the Propontis) seems to have been occupied, anterior to the Hellenic settlements, by Mysians and Teukrians—who are mentioned together, in such manner as to show that there was no great ethnical difference between them.³ The elegiac poet Kallinus, in the middle of the seventh century B.C., was the first who mentioned the Teukrians; treating them as immigrants from Krête, though other authors represented them as indigenous, or as having come from Attica. However the fact may stand as to their origin, we may gather that in the time of Kallinus they were still the great occupants of the Troad.⁴ Gradually the south and west coasts, as well as the interior of this region, became penetrated by successive colonies of Æolic Greeks, to whom the iron and ship timber of Mount Ida were valuable acquisitions. Thus the small Teukrian townships (for there were no considerable cities) became Æolised; while on the coast northward of Ida, along the Hellespont and Propontis, Ionic establishments were formed from Milêtus and Phôkæa, and Milesian colonists were received into the inland town of Skêpsis.⁵ In the time of Kallinus, the Teukrians seem to have been in possession of Hamaxitus and Kolônæ, with the worship of the Sminthian Apollo, in the south-western region of the Troad: a century and a half afterwards, at the time of the Ionic revolt, Herodotus notices the inhabitants of Gergis (occupying a portion of the northern region of Ida in the line eastward from Dardanus and Ophryniön) as “the remnant of the ancient Teukrians.”⁶ We also find the Mityleneans and Athenians contending by arms about 600-580 B.C. for the possession of Sigæum

Continental settlements of Lesbos and Tenedos.

Ante-Hellenic inhabitants in the region of Mount Ida—Mysians and Teukrians.

¹ Thueyd. iv. 52; viii. 108. Strabo, xiii. p. 610; Stephan. Byz. Ἀσσοί; Pausan. vi. 4, 5.

² Pseudo-Herod. Vit. Hom. c. 20:—

Ἰδης ἐν κορυφῇσι πολυπύχου ἡνεμοέσσης,
Ἐἴθα σίδηρος Ἄρηος ἐπιχθονίοισι βρότοισι
Ἔσσεται, εὖτ' ἂν μιν Κεβρήνιοι ἄνδρες ἔχωσι.

Τὰ δὲ Κεβρήνια τούτων τὸν χρόνον
κτεῖν παρσκευάζοντο οἱ Κυμαίοι πρὸς
τῇ Ἰδῇ, καὶ γίνεται αὐτόθι σίδηρος.

³ Herodot. vii. 20.

⁴ Kallinus ap. Strabo. xiii. p. 604: compare p. 613, οὗς πρῶτος παρέδωκε Καλλίως, &c.

⁵ Strabo, xiii. p. 607-635.

⁶ Herodot. v. 122. εἶλε μὲν Αἰολέας πάντας, ὅσοι τὴν Ἰλίδά νέμονται, εἶλε δὲ Γέργιθας, τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν, &c.

The Teukrians, in the conception of Herodotus, were the Trojans described in the Iliad—the Τευκρὶς γῆ seems the same as Ἰλιάς γῆ (ii. 118).

at the entrance of the Hellespont.¹ Probably the Lesbian settlements on the southern coast of the Troad, lying as they do so much nearer to the island, as well as the Tenedian settlements on the western coast opposite Tenedos, had been formed at some time prior to this epoch. We farther read of Æolic inhabitants as possessing Sestos on the European side of the Hellespont.² The name Teukrians gradually vanished out of present use, and came to belong only to the legends of the past; preserved either in connexion with the worship of the Sminthian Apollo, or by writers such as Hellanikus and Kephâlôn of Gergis, from whence it passed to the later poets and to the Latin epic. It appears that the native place of Kephâlôn was a town called Gergis or Gergithes near Kymê: there was also another place called Gergêtha on the river Kaïkus, near its sources, and therefore higher up in Mysia. It was from Gergithes near Kymê (according to Strabo), that the place called Gergis in Mount Ida was settled:³ probably the non-Hellenic inhabitants, both near Kymê and in the region of Ida, were of kindred race, but the settlers who went from Kymê to Gergis in Ida were doubtless Greeks, and contributed in this manner to the conversion of that place from a Teukrian to an Hellenic settlement. In one of those violent dislocations of inhabitants, which were so frequent afterwards among the successors of Alexander in Asia Minor, the Teukro-Hellenic population of the Idæan Gergis is said to have been carried away by Attalus of Pergamus, in order to people the village of Gergêtha near the river Kaïkus.

We must regard the Æolic Greeks as occupying not only their twelve cities on the continent round the Elæitic Gulf, and the neighbouring islands, of which the chief were Lesbos and Tenedos—but also as gradually penetrating and hellenising the Idæan region and the Troad. This last process belongs probably to a period subsequent to 776 B.C., but Kymê and Lesbos doubtless count as Æolic from an earlier period.

Of Mitylênê, the chief city of Lesbos, we hear some facts between the fortieth and fiftieth Olympiad (620-580 B.C.), which unfortunately reach us only in a faint echo. That city then numbered as its own the distinguished names of Pittakus, Sappho, and Alkæus. Like many other Grecian communities of that time, it suffered much from intestine commotion, and experienced more than one violent revolution. The old

Mitylênê—
its political
dissensions—
its poets.

¹ Herodot. v. 94.

² Herodot. ix. 115.

³ Strabo, xiii. 589-616.

oligarchy called the Penthilids (seemingly a gens with heroic origin), rendered themselves intolerably obnoxious by misrule of the most reckless character; their brutal use of the bludgeon in the public streets was avenged by Megaklês and his friends, who slew them and put down their government.¹ About the forty-second Olympiad (612 B.C.) we hear of Melanchrus, as despot of Mitylênê, who was slain by the conspiracy of Pittakus, Kikis, and Antimenidas—the last two being brothers of Alkæus the poet. Other despots, Myrsilus, Megalagyrus, and the Kleanaktidæ, whom we know only by name, and who appear to have been immortalized chiefly by the bitter stanzas of Alkæus, acquired afterwards the sovereignty of Mitylênê. Among all the citizens of the town, however, the most fortunate, and the most deserving, was Pittakus the son of Hyrrhadus—a champion trusted by his countrymen alike in foreign war and in intestine broils.²

The foreign war in which the Mityleneans were engaged and in which Pittakus commanded them, was against the Athenians on the continental coast opposite to Lesbos, in the Troad near Sigeium. The Mityleneans had already established various settlements along the Troad, the northernmost of which was Achilleium. They laid claim to the possession of the whole line of coast, and when Athens (about the 43rd Olympiad, as it is said³) attempted to plant a settlement at Sigeium, they resisted the establishment by force. At the head of the Mitylenean troops, Pittakus engaged in single combat with the Athenian commander Phrynôn, and had the good fortune to kill him. The general struggle was however carried on with no very decisive result. On one memorable occasion the Mityleneans fled; and Alkæus the poet, serving as an hoplite in their ranks, commemorated in one of his odes both his flight and the humiliating loss of his shield, which the victorious

Power and
merit of Pit-
takus.

Alkæus the
poet—his
flight from
battle.

¹ Aristot. Polit. v. 8, 13.

² Diogen. Laërt. i. 74; Suidas, v. *Kikis*, *Πίττακος*; Strabo, xiii. p. 617. Two lines of Alkæus are preserved, exulting in the death of Myrsilus (Alkæus, Fragm. 12, ed. Schneidewin). Melanchrus also is named (Fragm. 13), and Pittakus, in a third fragment (73, ed. Schneid.), is brought into connexion with Myrsilus.

³ In regard to the chronology of this war see a note near the end of my previous chapter on the Solonian legislation. I have there noticed what I believe to be a chronological mistake of Herodotus in regard to the period be-

tween 600-560 B.C. Herodotus considers this war between the Mityleneans and Athenians, in which Pittakus and Alkæus were concerned, to have been directed by Peisistratus, whose government did not commence until 560 B.C. (Herodot. v. 94, 95).

My suspicion is, that there were two Athenian expeditions to these regions,—one (probably colonial) in the time of Alkæus and Pittakus; a second, much afterwards, undertaken by order of Peisistratus, whose illegitimate son Hegesistratus, became, in consequence, despot of Sigeium. Herodotus appears to me to have merged the two into one.

Athenians suspended as a trophy in the temple of Athênê at Sigeium. His predecessor Archilochus, and his imitator Horace, have both been frank enough to confess a similar misfortune, which Tyrtaeus perhaps would not have endured to survive.¹ It was at length agreed by Mitylênê and Athens to refer the dispute to Periander of Corinth. While the Mityleneans laid claim to the whole line of coast, the Athenians alleged that inasmuch as a contingent from Athens had served in the host of Agamemnon against Troy, their descendants had as good a right as any other Greeks to share in the conquered ground. It appears that Periander felt unwilling to decide this delicate question of legendary law. He directed that each party should retain what they possessed; a verdict² still remembered and appealed to even in the time of Aristotle, by the inhabitants of Tenedos against those of Sigeium.

Though Pittakus and Alkæus were both found in the same line of hoplites against the Athenians at Sigeium, yet in the domestic politics of their native city, their bearing was that of bitter enemies. Alkæus and Antimenidas his brother were worsted in this party-feud, and banished: but even as exiles they were strong enough seriously to alarm and afflict their fellow-citizens, while their party at home, and the general dissension within the walls, reduced Mitylênê to despair. In this calamitous condition, the Mityleneans had recourse to Pittakus, who—with his great rank in the state (his wife belonged to the old gens of the Pentilids), courage in the field, and reputation for wisdom—inspired greater confidence than any other citizen of his time. He was by universal consent named *Æsymnete* or dictator for ten years, with unlimited powers:³ and the appointment proved eminently successful. How effectually he repelled the exiles, and maintained domestic tranquillity, is best shown by the angry effusions of Alkæus; whose songs (unfortunately lost) gave vent to the political hostility of the time in the same manner as the speeches of the Athenian orators two centuries afterwards—and who, in his vigorous invectives against Pittakus, did not spare even the coarsest nicknames, founded on alleged personal deformities.⁴ Respecting

¹ See the difficult fragment of Alkæus (Fr. 24, ed. Schneidewin) preserved in Strabo, xiii. p. 600; Herodot. v. 94, 95; Archilochus, Eleg. Fr. i. 5, ed. Schneidewin; Horat. Carm. ii. 7, 9; perhaps also Anakreon, but not certainly (see Fr. 81, ed. Schneidewin), is to be regarded as having thrown away his shield.

² Aristot. Rhetoric. i. 16, 2, where *ἐναγχος* marks the date. Aristotle passed some time in these regions, at Atarneus, with the despot Hermeias.

³ Aristot. Polit. iii. 9, 5, 6; Dionys. Halik. Ant. Rom. v. 73; Plehn, Lesbica, p. 46–50.

⁴ Diogen. Laërt. i. 81.

Bitter opposition of Pittakus and Alkæus in internal politics.

Pittakus is created *Æsymnete*, or Dictator of Mitylênê.

the proceedings of this eminent Dictator, the contemporary and reported friend of Solon, we know only in a general way, that he succeeded in re-establishing security and peace, and that at the end of his term he voluntarily laid down his power¹—affording presumption not only of probity superior to the lures of ambition, but also of that conscious moderation during the period of his dictatorship which left him without fear as a private citizen afterwards. He enacted various laws for Mitylênê, one of which was sufficiently curious to cause it to be preserved and commented on—for it prescribed double penalties against offences committed by men in a state of intoxication.² But he did not (like Solon at Athens) introduce any constitutional changes, nor provide any new formal securities for public liberty and good government:³ which illustrates the remark previously made, that Solon in doing this was beyond his age and struck out new lights for his successors—since on the score of personal disinterestedness, Pittakus and he are equally unimpeachable. What was the condition of Mitylênê afterwards, we have no authorities to tell us. Pittakus is said (if the chronological computers of a later age can be trusted) to have died in the 52nd Olympiad (B.C. 572-568). Both he and Solon are numbered among the Seven Wise Men of Greece, respecting whom something will be said in a future chapter. The various anecdotes current about him are little better than uncertified exemplifications of a spirit of equal and generous civism: but his songs and his elegiac compositions were familiar to literary Greeks in the age of Plato.

¹ Strabo, xiii. p. 617; Diogen. Laërt. i. 75; Valer. Maxim. vi. 5, 1.

² Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 9; Rhetoric. ii. 27, 2.

A ditty is said to have been sung by the female grinding slaves in Lesbos, when the mill went heavily: "Ἀλεῖ, μύλα, ἄλει καὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἄλει, Tās megalas Mitylânas basileûwn—"Grind, mill, grind; for Pittakus also grinds, the master of great Mitylênê." This has the air of a genuine composition of

the time, set forth by the enemies of Pittakus, and imputing to him (through a very intelligible metaphor) tyrannical conduct; though both Plutarch (Sept. Sap. Conv. c. 14. p. 157) and Diogenes Laërt. (i. 81) construe it literally, as if Pittakus had been accustomed to take bodily exercise at the hand-mill.

³ Aristot. Polit. ii. 9, 9. ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ Πιττακὸς νόμων δημιουργὸς, ἀλλ' οὐ πολιτείας.

CHAPTER XV.

ASIATIC DORIANS.

THE islands of Rhodes, Kôs, Symê, Nisyros, Kasus, and Karpathus, are represented in the Homeric catalogue as furnishing troops to the Grecian armament before Troy. Historical Rhodes, and historical Kôs, are occupied by Dorians, the former Asiatic Dorians—their Hexapolis. with its three separate cities of Lindus, Jalysus, and Kameirus. Two other Dorian cities, both on the adjacent continent, are joined with these four as members of an Amphiktyony on the Triopian promontory or south-western corner of Asia Minor—thus constituting an Hexapolis, including Halikarnassus, Knidus, Kôs, Lindus, Jalysus, and Kameirus. Knidus was situated on the Triopian promontory itself; Halikarnassus more to the northward, on the northern coast of the Keramic Gulf: neither of the two are named in Homer.

The legendary account of the origin of these Asiatic Dorians has already been given, and we are compelled to accept their Hexapolis as a portion of the earliest Grecian history, of which no previous account can be rendered. The circumstance of Rhodes and Kôs being included in the Catalogue of the Iliad leads us to suppose that they were Greek at an earlier period than the Ionic or Æolic settlements. It may be remarked that both the brothers Antiphus and Pheidippus from Kôs, and Tlêpolemus from Rhodes, are Herakleids,—the only Herakleids who figure in the Iliad: and the deadly combat between Tlêpolemus and Sarpêdôn may perhaps be an heroic copy drawn from real contests, which doubtless often took place between the Rhodians and their neighbours the Lykians. That Rhodes and Kôs were already Dorian at the period of the Homeric Catalogue, I see no reason for doubting. They are not called Dorian in that Catalogue, but we may well suppose that the name Dorian had not at that early period come to be employed as a great distinctive class name, as it was afterwards used in contrast with Ionian and Æolian. In relating the history of Pheidôn of Argos, I have mentioned various reasons for suspecting that the trade of the Dorians on the eastern coast of the Peloponnesus was considerable at an early period, and there

may well have been Doric migrations by sea to Krête and Rhodes, anterior to the time of the *Iliad*.

Herodotus tells us that the six Dorian towns, which had established their Amphiktyony on the Triopian promontory, were careful to admit none of the neighbouring Dorians to partake of it. Of these neighbouring Dorians, we make out the islands of Astypalæa, and Kalymnæ,¹ Nisyrus, Karpathus, Symê, Têlus, Kasus, and Chalkia; also, on the continental coast, Myndus, situated on the same peninsula with Halikarnassus—and Phasêlis, on the eastern coast of Lykia towards Pamphylia. The strong coast-rock of Iasus, midway between Milêtus and Halikarnassus, is said to have been originally founded by Argeians, but was compelled in consequence of destructive wars with the Karians to admit fresh settlers and a Neleid Ækist from Milêtus.² Bargylia and Karyanda seem to have been Karian settlements more or less hellenised. There probably were other Dorian towns, not specially known to us, upon whom this exclusion from the Triopian solemnities was brought to operate. The six Amphiktyonised cities were in course of time reduced to five, by the exclusion of Halikarnassus: the reason for which (as we are told) was, that a citizen of Halikarnassus, who had gained a tripod as prize, violated the regulation, which required that the tripod should always be consecrated as an offering in the Triopian temple, in order that he might carry it off to decorate his own house.³ The Dorian Amphiktyony was thus contracted into a Pentapolis. At what time this incident took place we do not know, nor is it perhaps unreasonable to conjecture that the increasing predominance of the Karian element at Halikarnassus had some effect in producing the exclusion, as well as the individual misbehaviour of the victor Agasiklês.

Other Dorians, not included in the Hexapolis.

Exclusion of Halikarnassus from the Hexapolis.

¹ See the Inscriptions in Boeckh's collection, 2483–2671: the latter is an Iasian Inscription, reciting a Doric decree by the inhabitants of Kalymnæ;

also Ahrens, *De Dialecto Doricâ*, p. 15, 553; Diodor. v. 53, 54.

² Polyb. xvi. 5.

³ Herodot. i. 144.

CHAPTER XVI.

NATIVES OF ASIA MINOR WITH WHOM THE GREEKS BECAME
CONNECTED.

FROM the Grecian settlements on the coast of Asia Minor, and on the adjacent islands, our attention must now be turned to those non-Hellenic kingdoms and people with whom they there came in contact.

Our information with respect to all of them is unhappily very scanty. And we shall not improve our narrative by taking the catalogue, presented in the *Iliad*, of allies of Troy, and construing it as if it were a chapter of geography. If any proof were wanting of the unpromising results of such a proceeding, we may find it in the confusion which darkens so much of the work of Strabo—who perpetually turns aside from the actual and ascertainable condition of the countries which he is describing, to conjectures on Homeric antiquity, often announced as if they were unquestionable facts. Where the Homeric geography is confirmed by other evidence, we note the fact with satisfaction; where it stands unsupported, or difficult to reconcile with other statements, we cannot venture to reason upon it as in itself a substantial testimony. The author of the *Iliad*, as he has congregated together a vast body of the different sections of Greeks for the attack of the consecrated hill of Ilium, so he has also summoned all the various inhabitants of Asia Minor to co-operate in its defence. He has planted portions of the Kilikians and Lykians, whose historical existence is on the southern coast, in the immediate vicinity of the Troad. Those only will complain of this who have accustomed themselves to regard him as an historian or geographer. If we are content to read him only as the first of poets, we shall no more quarrel with him for a geographical misplacément, than with his successor Arktinus for bringing on the battle-field of Ilium the Amazons or the Æthiopians.

The geography of Asia Minor is even now very imperfectly known,¹ and the matters ascertained respecting its ancient divisions

¹ For the general geography of Asia Minor, see Albert Forbiger, *Handbuch der Alt. Geogr.* part ii. sect. 61, and an instructive little treatise, *Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte in Klein Asien*, by Franz and Kiepert, Berlin 1840, with a

and boundaries relate almost entirely either to the later periods of the Persian empire, or to times after the Macedonian and even after the Roman conquest. To state them as they stood in the time of Cræsus king of Lydia, before the arrival of the conquering Cyrus, is a task in which we find little evidence to sustain us. The great mountain chain of Taurus, which begins from the Chelidonian promontory on the southern coast of Lykia, and strikes north-eastward as far as Armenia, formed the most noted boundary-line during the Roman times. But Herodotus does not once mention it; the river Halys is in his view the most important geographical limit. Northward of Taurus, on the upper portions of the rivers Halys and Sangarius, was situated the spacious and lofty central plain of Asia Minor. To the north, west, and south of this central plain, the region is chiefly mountainous, as it approaches all the three seas, the Euxine, the Ægean, and the Pamphylian—most mountainous in the case of the latter, permitting no rivers of long course. The mountains Kadmus, Messôgis, Tmôlus, stretch westward towards the Ægean Sea, yet leaving extensive spaces of plain and long valleys, so that the Mæander, the Kaïster, and the Hermus, have each considerable length of course. The north-western part includes the mountainous regions of Ida, Têmnus, and the Mysian Olympus, with much admixture of fertile and productive ground. The elevated tracts near the Euxine appear to have been the most wooded—especially Kytôrus: the Parthenius, the Sangarius, the Halys, and the Iris, are all considerable streams flowing northward towards that sea. Nevertheless, the plain land interspersed through these numerous elevations was often of the greatest fertility; and as a whole, the peninsula of Asia Minor was considered as highly productive by the ancients, in grain, wine, fruit, cattle, and in many parts, oil; though the cold central plain did not carry the olive.¹

Features of
the country.

Along the western shores of this peninsula, where the various bands of Greek emigrants settled, we hear of Pelasgians, Teukrians, Mysians, Bithynians, Phrygians, Lydians or Mæonians, Karians, Lelegians. Farther

Names and
situations of
the different
people.

map of Phrygia annexed. The latter is particularly valuable as showing us how much yet remains to be made out: it is not unfrequently the practice with the compilers of geographical manuals to make a show of full knowledge, and to disguise the imperfection of their data. Nor do they always keep in view the necessity of distinguishing between the

territorial names and divisions of one age and those of another.

¹ Cicero, *Pro Lege Maniliâ*, c. 6; Strabo, xii. p. 572; Herodot. v. 32. See the instructive account of the spread and cultivation of the olive tree, in Ritter, *Erdkunde, West-Asien*, b. iii., Abtheilung iii.; Abschn. i. s. 50. p. 522-537.

eastward are Lykians, Pisidians, Kilikians, Phrygians, Kappadokians, Paphlagonians, Mariandynians, &c. Speaking generally, we may say that the Phrygians, Teukrians and Mysians appear in the north-western portion, between the river Hermus and the Propontis—the Karians and Lelegians south of the river Mæander,—and the Lydians in the central region between the two. Pelasgians are found here and there, seemingly both in the valley of the Hermus and in that of the Kaïster. Even in the time of Herodotus, there were Pelasgian settlements at Plakia and Skylakê on the Propontis, westward of Kyzikus: and O. Müller would trace the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians to Tyrrha, an inland town of Lydia, from whence he imagines (though without much probability) the name Tyrrhenian to be derived.

One important fact to remark, in respect to the native population of Asia Minor at the first opening of this history, is, that they were not aggregated into great kingdoms or confederations, nor even into any large or populous cities—but distributed into many inconsiderable tribes, so as to present no overwhelming resistance, and threaten no formidable danger, to the successive bodies of Greek emigrants. The only exception to this is, the Lydian monarchy of Sardis, the real strength of which begins with Gygês and the dynasty of the Mermnadæ, about 700 B.C. Though the increasing force of that kingdom ultimately extinguished the independence of the Greeks in Asia, it seems to have noway impeded their development, as it stood when they first arrived and for a long time afterwards. Nor were either Karians or Mysians united under any one king, so as to possess facilities for aggression or conquest.

As far as can be made out from our scanty data, it appears that all the nations of Asia Minor west of the river Halys, were, in a large sense, of kindred race with each other, as well as with the Thracians on the European side of the Bosphorus and Hellespont. East of the Halys dwelt the people of Syro-Arabian or Semitic race,—Assyrians, Syrians, and Kappadokians—as well as Kilikians, Pamphylians and Solymi, along its upper course and farther southward to the Pamphylian sea. Westward of the Halys the languages were not Semitic, but belonging to a totally different family¹—cognate,

Not originally aggregated into large kingdoms or cities.

River Halys—the ethnographical boundary. Syro-Arabbians eastward of that river.

¹ Herodot. i. 72; Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, Part i. abth. i. p. 142-145. It may be remarked, however, that the Armenians, eastward of the Halys, are treated by

Herodotus as colonists from the Phrygians (vii. 73): Stephanus Byz. says the same v. Ἀρμενία, adding also, καὶ τῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ φρυγίζουσι. The more careful researches of modern linguists, after

yet distinct one from another, perhaps not mutually intelligible. The Karians, Lydians and Mysians recognised a certain degree of brotherhood with each other, attested by common religious sacrifices in the temple of Zeus Karios at Mylasa.¹ But it is by no means certain that each of these nations mutually comprehended each other's speech. Herodotus, from whom we derive the knowledge of these common sacrifices, acquaints us at the same time that the Kaunians in the south-western corner of the peninsula had no share in them, though speaking the same language as the Karians. He does not, however, seem to consider identity or difference of language as a test of national affinity.

Along the coast of the Euxine, from the Thracian Bosphorus eastward to the river Halys, dwelt Bithynians or Thynians, Mariandynians and Paphlagonians — all recognised branches of the widely-extended Thracian race. The Bithynians especially, in the north-western portion of this territory, reaching from the Euxine to the Propontis, are often spoken of as Asiatic Thracians—while on the other hand various tribes among the Thracians of Europe are denominated Thyni or Thynians :² so little difference was there in the population on the two sides of the Bosphorus, alike brave, predatory, and sanguinary. The Bithynians of Asia are also sometimes called Bebrykians, under which denomination they extend as far southward as the Gulf of Kios in the Propontis.³ They here come in contact with Mygdonians, Mysians and Phrygians. Along the southern coast of the Propontis, between the rivers Rhyndakus and Æsêpus, in immediate

Thracian
race—in the
north of Asia
Minor.

much groundless assertion on the part of those who preceded them, have shown that the Armenian language belongs in its structure to the Indo-Germanic family, and is essentially distinct from the Semitic: see Ritter, *Erdkunde, West-Asien*, b. iii. abth. iii.; Abschn. i. 5. 36. p. 577–582. Herodotus rarely takes notice of the language spoken, nor does he on this occasion, when speaking of the river Halys as a boundary.

¹ Herodot. i. 170, 171.

² Strabo, vii. pp. 295–303; xii. pp. 542, 564, 565, 572: Herodot. i. 28; vii. 74, 75: Xenophon. *Hellenic*. i. 3, 2; *Anabasis*, vii. 2, 22–32. Mannert, *Geographie der Gr. und Römer*, b. viii. ch. ii. p. 403.

³ Dionys. *Periegêt.* 805; Apollodôrus, i. 9, 20. Theokritus puts the Bebrykians on the coast of the Euxine—*Id.* xxii. 29; Syncell. p. 340, Bonn. The story in Appian, *Bell. Mithridat.* init. is

a singular specimen of Grecian fancy, and anxiety to connect the antiquities of a nation with the Trojan war. The Greeks whom he followed assigned the origin of the Bithynians to Thracian followers of Rhêsus, who fled from Troy after the latter had been killed by Diomêdes: Dolonkus, eponym of the Thracians in the Chersonesus, is called brother of Bithynus (Steph. *Byz.* *Δόλογκος* — *Βιθυνία*).

The name *Μαριανδυνολ*, like *Βιθυνολ*, may probably be an extension or compound of the primitive *Θυνολ*; perhaps also *Βέβρυκες* stands in the same relation to *Βρυγές* or *Φρυγές*. Hellanikus wrote *Θύμβριον*, *Δύμβριον* (Steph. *Byz.* in v.).

Kios is Mysian in Herodotus, v. 122: according to Skylax, the coast from the Gulf of Astakus to that of Kios is Mysia (c. 93).

neighbourhood with the powerful Greek colony of Kyzikus, appear the Doliones ; next, Pelasgians at Plakia and Skylakê ; then again, along the coast of the Hellespont near Abydos and Lampsakus, and occupying a portion of the Troad, we find mention made of other Bebrykians.¹ In the interior of the Troad, or the region of Ida, are Teukrians and Mysians. The latter seem to extend southward down to Pergamus and the region of Mount Sipylus, and eastward to the mountainous region called the Mysian Olympus, south of the lake Askanius, near which they join with the Phrygians.²

As far as any positive opinion can be formed respecting nations of whom we know so little, it would appear that the Mysians and Phrygians are a sort of connecting link between Lydians and Karians on one side, and Thracians (European as well as Asiatic) on the other—a remote ethnical affinity pervading the whole. Ancient migrations are spoken of in both directions across the Hellespont and the Thracian Bosphorus. It was the opinion of some that Phrygians, Mysians and Thracians had immigrated into Asia from Europe ; and the Lydian historian Xanthus referred the arrival of the Phrygians to an epoch subsequent to the Trojan war.³ On the other hand, Herodotus speaks of a vast body of Teukrians and Mysians, who, before the Trojan war, had crossed the strait from Asia into Europe, expelled many of the European Thracians from their seats, crossed the Strymôn and the Macedonian rivers, and penetrated as far southward as the river Peneus in Thessaly—as far westward as the Ionic Gulf. This Teukro-Mysian migration (he tells us) brought about two consequences : first, the establishment near the river Strymôn of the Pæonians, who called themselves Teukrian colonists ;⁴ next, the crossing into Asia of many of the dispossessed Thracian tribes from the neighbourhood of the Strymôn into the north-western region of Asia Minor, by which the Bithynian or Asiatic Thracian people was formed. The Phrygians also are supposed by some to have originally occupied an European soil on the borders of Macedonia near the snow-clad Mount Bermion, at which time they were called Briges,—an appellative name in the Lydian language equivalent to freemen or

¹ Charon of Lampsakus, Fr. 7, ed. Didot. *Χάρων δὲ φησὶ καὶ τὴν Λαμψακηνῶν χώραν προτέραν Βεβρυκίαν καλεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικησάντων αὐτὴν Βεβρύκων· τὸ δὲ γένος αὐτῶν ἡφάνισται διὰ τοὺς γενομένους πολέμους.* Strabo,

xiii. p. 586; Conon, Narr. 12; Dionys. Hal. i. 54.

² Hekataeus, Frag. 204, ed. Didot; Apollodôr. i. 9, 18; Strabo, xii. p. 564–575.

³ Xanth. Fragm. 5, ed. Didot.

⁴ Herodot. vii. 20–75.

Franks:¹ while the Mysians are said to have come from the north-eastern portions of European Thrace south of the Danube, known under the Roman empire by the name of *Mœsia*.² But with respect to the Mysians there was also another story, according to which they were described as colonists emanating from the Lydians; put forth according to that system of devoting by solemn vow a tenth of the inhabitants, chosen by lot, to seek settlements elsewhere, which recurs not unfrequently among the stories of early emigrations, as the consequence of distress and famine. And this last opinion was supported by the character of the Mysian language, half Lydian and half Phrygian, of which both the Lydian historian Xanthus, and Menekratês of Elæa,³ (by whom the opinion was announced,) must have been very competent judges.

From such tales of early migration both ways across the Hellespont and the Bosphorus, all that we can with any certainty infer is, a certain measure of affinity among the population of Thrace and Asia Minor—especially visible in the case of the Phrygians and Mysians. The name and legends of the Phrygian hero Midas are connected with different towns throughout the extensive region of Asiatic Phrygia—Kelænæ, Pessinûs, Ankyra,⁴ Gordium—as well as with the neighbourhood of Mount Bermion in Macedonia. The adventure whereby Midas got possession of Silenus, mixing wine with the spring of which he drank, was localised at the latter place as well as at the town of Thymbriion, nearly at the eastern extremity of Asiatic Phrygia.⁵ The name Mygdonia, and the eponymous hero Mygdôn, belong not less to the European territory near the river Axios (afterwards a part of Macedonia) than to the Asiatic coast of the eastern Propontis, between Kios and the river Rhyndakus.⁶ Otreus and

Partial
identity of
legends.

¹ Strabo, vii. p. 295; xii. p. 550; Herodot. vii. 73; Hesych. v. *Βρύγα*.

² Strabo, vii. p. 295; xii. pp. 542, 564, 571, where he cites the geographer Artemidôrus. In the passage of the *Iliad* (xiii. 5), the *Μυσοί ἀρχέμαχοι* appear to be conceived by the poet in European Thrace; but Apollodôrus does not seem to have so construed the passage. Niebuhr (Kleine Schriften, p. 370) expresses himself more confidently than the evidence warrants.

³ Strabo, xii. p. 572; Herodot. vii. 74.

⁴ Diodor. iii. 59; Arrian, ii. 3, 1; Quint. Curt. iii. 1, 12; Athenæ. x. p. 415. We may also notice the town of

Κορυδαίων near *Μιδδαίων* in Phrygia, as connected with the name of the Thracian goddess *Kotys* (Strabo, x. p. 470; xii. p. 576).

⁵ Herodot. viii. 138; Theopompus, Frag. 74, 75, 76, Didot (he introduced a long dialogue between Midas and Silenus—Dionys. Halik. Vett. Script. Censur. p. 70; Theon. Progymnas. c. 2); Strabo, xiv. p. 680; Xenophon. Anab. i. 2, 13.

⁶ Strabo, xii. p. 575, 576; Steph. Byz. *Μυγδονία*; Thucyd. ii. 99. The territory Mygdonia and the Mygdonians, in the distant region of Mesopotamia, eastward of the river Chaboras (Plutarch, Lucullus, 32; Polyb. v. 51;

Mygdôn are the commanders of the Phrygians in the *Iliad*; and the river Odrysês, which flowed through the territory of the Asiatic Mygdonians into the Rhyndakus, affords another example of homonymy with the Odrysian Thracians¹ in Europe. And as these coincidences of names and legends conduct us to the idea of analogy and affinity between Thracians and Phrygians, so we find Archilochus, the earliest poet remaining to us who mentions them as contemporaries, coupling the two in the same simile.² To this early Parian Iambist, the population on the two sides of the Hellespont appears to have presented similarity of feature and customs.

To settle with any accuracy the extent and condition of these Phrygians. Asiatic nations during the early days of Grecian settlement among them is impracticable. The problem was not to be solved even by the ancient geographers, with their superior means of knowledge. The early indigenous distribution of the Phrygian population is unknown to us; for even the division into the Greater and Lesser Phrygia belongs to a period at least subsequent to the Persian conquest (like most of the recognised divisions of Asia Minor), and is only misleading if applied to the period earlier than Croesus. It appears that the name Phrygians, like that of Thracians, was a generic designation, and comprehended tribes or separate communities who had also specific names of their own. We trace Phrygians at wide distances: on the western bank of the river Halys—at Kelænæ, in the interior of Asia Minor, on the upper course of the river Mæander—and on the coast of the Propontis near Kios. In both of these latter localities there is a salt

Xenophon, *Anab.* iv. 3, 4), is difficult to understand, since it is surprising to find a branch of these more westerly Asiatics in the midst of the Syro-Arabian population. Strabo (xv. p. 747) justly supposes it to date only from the times of the Macedonian conquest of Asia, which would indeed be disproved by the mention of the name in Xenophon; but this reading in the text of Xenophon is rejected by the best recent editors, since several MSS. have *Μαγδόνιοι* in place of *Μυγδόνιοι*. See Forliger, *Handbuch der Alten Geographie*, Part ii. sect. 98. p. 628.

¹ *Iliad*, iii. 188; Strabo, xii. p. 551. The town of Otrœa, of which Otreus seems to be the eponymus, was situated in Phrygia just on the borders of Bithynia (Strabo, xii. p. 566).

² Archiloch. *Fragm.* 28 Schneid., 26 Gaisf.—

.....ὥσπερ αὐλῶ βρῦτον ἢ Θρηϊεῖς ἀνὴρ
*Η Φρὺς ἐβρῦζε, &c.

The passage is too corrupt to support any inference, except the near approximation in the poet's mind of Thracians and Phrygians. The phrase *αὐλῶ βρῦτον βρύζειν* is probably to be illustrated by the *Anabasis* of Xenophon (iv. 5. 27), where he describes the half-starved Greek soldiers refreshing themselves in the Armenian villages. They found there large bowls full of barley-wine or beer, with the grains of barley floating in it. They drank the liquid by sucking through long reeds or straws without any joint in them (*κάλαμοι γόνατα οὐκ ἔχοντες*) which they found put there for the express purpose.

lake called Askanius, which is the name both of the leader of the Phrygian allies of Troy and of the country from whence they are said to come, in the *Iliad*.¹ They thus occupy a territory bounded on the south by the Pisidian mountains—on the west by the Lydians (indicated by a terminal pillar set up by Cræsus at Kydrara²)—on the east by the river Halys, on the other side of which were Kappadokians or Syrians:—on the north by Paphlagonians and Mariandynians. But it seems besides this, that they must have extended farther to the west, so as to occupy a great portion of the region of Mount Ida and the Troad. For Apollodorus considered that both the Doliones and the Bebrykians were included in the great Phrygian name;³ and even in the ancient poem called ‘Phorônīs’ (which can hardly be placed later than 600 B.C.), the Daktyls of Mount Ida, the great discoverers of metallurgy, are expressly named Phrygian.⁴ The custom of the Attic tragic poets to call the inhabitants of the Troad Phrygians, does not necessarily imply any translation of inhabitants, but an employment of the general name, as better known to the audience whom they addressed, in preference to the less notorious specific name—just as the inhabitants of Bithynia might be described either as Bithynians or as Asiatic Thracians.

If (as the language of Herodotus and Ephorus⁵ would seem to imply) we suppose the Phrygians to be at a considerable distance from the coast and dwelling only in the interior, it will be difficult to explain to ourselves how or where the early Greek colonists came to be so much influenced by them; whereas the supposition that the tribes occupying the Troad and the region of Ida were Phrygians elucidates this point. And the fact is incontestable, that both Phrygians and Lydians did not only modify the religious manifestations of the Asiatic Greeks, and through them of the Grecian world generally—but also rendered important aid towards the first creation of the Grecian musical scale. Of this the denominations of the scale afford a proof.

¹ *Iliad*, ii. 873; xiii. 792: Arrian, i. 29; Herodot. vii. 30. The boundary of the Phrygians southward towards the Pisidians, and westward as well as north-westward towards the Lydians and Mysians, could never be distinctly traced (Strabo, xii. pp. 564, 576, 628): the volcanic region called Katakekaumenê is referred in Xenophon's time to Mysia (Anab. i. 2, 10): compare the remarks of Kiepert in the treatise above referred to, *Fünf Inschriften und fünf Städte*, p. 27.

² Herodot. i. 72; vii. 30.

³ Strabo, xiv. p. 678: compare xiii. p. 586. The legend makes Doliôn son of Silênus, who is so much connected with the Phrygian Midas (Alexand. *Ætulus* ap. Strab. xiv. p. 681).

⁴ Phorônīs, *Fragm.* 5, ed. Düntzer, p. 57—

..... ἔνθα γόητες
Ἰδαίοι Φρυγῆς ἄνδρες, ὀρέστεροι, οἰκαδ' ἔβαιον, &c.

⁵ Ephorus ap. Strabo, xiv. p. 678; Herodot. v. 49.

Three primitive musical modes were employed by the Greek poets, in the earliest times of which later authors could find any account—the Lydian, which was the most acute—the Dorian, which was the most grave—and the Phrygian, intermediate between the two; the highest note of the Lydian being one tone higher, that of the Dorian one tone lower, than the highest note of the Phrygian scale.¹ Such were the three modes or scales, each including only a tetrachord, upon which the earliest Greek masters worked: many other scales, both higher and lower, were subsequently added. It thus appears that the earliest Greek music was, in large proportion, borrowed from Phrygia and Lydia. When we consider that in the eighth and seventh centuries before the Christian æra, music and poetry conjoined (often also with dancing or rhythmical gesticulation) was the only intellectual manifestation known among the Greeks—and moreover, that in the belief of all the ancient writers, every musical mode had its own peculiar emotional influences, powerfully modified the temper of hearers, and was intimately connected with the national worship—we shall see that this transmission of the musical modes implies much both of communication and interchange between the Asiatic Greeks and the indigenous population of the continent. Now the fact of communication between the Ionic and the Æolic Greeks, and their eastern neighbours, the Lydians, is easy to comprehend generally, though we have no details as to the way in which it took place. But we do not distinctly see where it was that the Greeks came so much into contact with the Phrygians, except in the region of Ida, the Troad, and the southern coast of the Propontis. To this region belonged those early Phrygian musicians (under the heroic names of Olympus, Hyagnis, Marsyas), from whom the Greeks borrowed.² And we may remark that the analogy between Thracians and Phrygians seems partly to hold in respect both to music and to religion;

¹ See the learned and valuable Dissertation of Boeckh, *De Metris Pindari*, iii. 8. p. 235-239.

² Plutarch, *De Musica*, c. 5, 7. p. 1132; Aristoxenus ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 624; Alkman, *Frag.* 104, ed. Bergk.

Aristoxenus seems to have considered the Phrygian Olympus as the great inventive genius who gave the start to Grecian music (Plutarch, *ib.* p. 1135-1141): his music was employed almost entirely for hymns to the gods, religious worship, the *Mêtrôa* or ceremonies in honour of the Great Mother (p. 1140).

Compare Clemens Alexand. *Strom.* i. p. 306.

Μαρσύας may perhaps have its etymology in the Karian or Lydian language. *Σούας* was in Karian equivalent to *τάφος* (see Steph. Byz. v. *Σουαγέλα*): *Mâ* was one of the various names of Rhea (Steph. Byz. v. *Μάστωνα*). The word would have been written *Μαρσούας* by an Æolic Greek.

Marsyas is represented by Telestês the dithyrambist as a satyr, son of a nymph—*νυμφαγενεῖ χειροκτύπῳ φησὶ Μαρσύα κλέος* (Telestês ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 617),

since the old mythe in the *Iliad*, wherein the Thracian bard *Thamyris*, rashly contending in song with the Muses, is conquered, blinded and stripped of his art, seems to be the prototype of the very similar story respecting the contention of *Apollo* with the Phrygian *Marsyas*¹—the cithara against the flute; while the Phrygian *Midas* is farther characterised as the religious disciple of Thracian *Orpheus*.

In my previous chapter relating to the legend of 'Troy,'² mention has been already made of the early fusion of the Æolic Greeks with the indigenous population of the 'Troad.' It is from hence probably that the Phrygian music with the flute as its instrument—employed in the orgiastic rites and worship of the Great Mother in Mount *Ida*, in the Mysian Olympus, and other mountain regions of the country, and even in the Greek city of *Lampsakus*³—passed to the Greek composers. Its introduction is coæval with the earliest facts respecting Grecian music, and must have taken place during the first century of the recorded Olympiads. In the Homeric poems we find no allusion to it, but it may probably have contributed to stimulate that development of lyric and elegiac composition which grew up among the post-homeric Æolians and Ionians, to the gradual displacement of the old epic. Another instance of the fusion of Phrygians with Greeks is to be found in the religious ceremonies of *Kyzikus*, *Kius*, and *Prusa*, on the southern and south-eastern coasts of the *Propontis*. At the first of the three places, the worship of the Great Mother of the Gods was celebrated with much solemnity on the hill of *Dindymon*, bearing the same name as that mountain in the interior, near *Pessinus*, from whence *Cybelê* derived her principal surname of *Dindymênê*.⁴ The analogy between the Kretan and Phrygian religious practices has been often noticed, and confusion occurs not unfrequently between Mount *Ida* in *Krête* and the mountain of the same name in the *Troad*; while the *Teukrians* of *Gergis* in the *Troad*—who were

Phrygian
music and
worship
among the
Greeks in
Asia Minor.

¹ Xenoph. *Anab.* i. 2, 8; Homer. *Iliad*, ii. 595; Strabo, xii. p. 578: the latter connects Olympus with *Kelænæ*, as well as *Marsyas*. Justin, xi. 7: "Mida, qui ab Orpheo sacrorum solemnibus initiatus, Phrygiam religionibus implevit."

The coins of *Midæion*, *Kadi*, and *Prymnêssus*, in the more northerly portion of Phrygia, bear the impress of the Phrygian hero *Midas* (*Eckhel*, *Doctrina Nummorum Vet.* iii. p. 143–168).

² Part I. ch. xv. p. 453.

³ The fragment of *Hippônax* mentioning an eunuch of *Lampsakus*, rich and well-fed, reveals to us the Asiatic habits, and probably worship, in that place (*Fragm.* 26, ed. Bergk):—

Θύναν τε καὶ μυττωτὸν ἡμέρας πάσας
Δαινύμενος, ὥσπερ Λαμψακηῶς εὐνούχους, &c.

⁴ Strabo, xii. p. 564–575; Herodot. iv. 76.

not yet Hellenised even at the time of the Persian invasion, and who were affirmed by the elegiac poet Kallinus to have immigrated from Krête—if they were not really Phrygians, differed so little from them as to be called such by the poets.

The Phrygians are celebrated by Herodotus for the abundance both of their flocks and their agricultural produce.¹ The excellent wool for which Milêtus was always renowned came in part from the upper valley of the river Mæander, which they inhabited. He contrasts them in this respect with the Lydians, among whom the attributes and capacities of persons dwelling in cities are chiefly brought to our view: much gold and silver, retail trade, indigenous games, unchastity of young women, yet combined with thrift and industry.² Phrygian cheese and salt-provisions—Lydian unguents,³ carpets and coloured shoes—acquired notoriety. Both Phrygians and Lydians are noticed by Greek authors subsequent to the establishment of the Persian empire as a people timid, submissive, industrious, and useful as slaves—an attribute not ascribed to the Mysians,⁴ who are usually described as brave and hardy mountaineers, difficult to hold in subjection: nor even true respecting the Lydians, during the earlier times anterior to the complete overthrow of Cræsus by Cyrus; for they were then esteemed for their warlike prowess. Nor was the different character of these two Asiatic people yet effaced even in the second century after the Christian æra. For the same Mysians, who in the time of Herodotus and Xenophon gave so much trouble to the Persian satraps, are described by the rhetor Aristeidês as seizing and plundering his property at Laneion near Hadriani—while on the contrary he mentions the Phrygians as habitually coming from the interior towards the coast regions to do the work of the olive-gathering.⁵ During the times of Grecian autonomy and ascendancy, in the fifth century B.C., the

¹ Herodot. v. 49. πολυπροβατώτατοι καὶ πολυκαρπώτατοι.

² Herodot. i. 93, 94.

³ Τάριχος Φρύγιον (Eupolis, Marik. Fr. 23. p. 506, Meincke)—τὺρδς, Athenæ. xii. 516 — ἰσχαδες, Alexis ap. Athenæ. iii. 75: some Phrygians however had never seen a fig-tree (Cicero pro Flacco, q. 17).

Carpets of Sardis (Athenæ. v. 197): φοινικίδες Σαρδικαὶ (Plato, Comicus ap. Athenæ. ii. 48); Ἀεὶ φιλόμυρον πᾶν τὸ Σάρδεων γένος (Alexis ap. Athenæ. xv. p. 691, and again *ib.* p. 690); Πόδας δὲ ποίκιλος μάσθλης ἐκάλυπτε Λύδιον κάλδν ἔργον (Sappho, Fragm. 54. ed.

Schneidewin; Schol. Aristoph. Pac. 1174).

⁴ Xenophon, Anab. i. 6, 7; iii. 2, 23; Memorab. iii. 5, 26, ἀκοντιστὰι Μυσοὶ; Æschyl. Pers. 40, ἀβροδίατοι Λύδοι.

⁵ Aristeid. Orat. xxvi. p. 346. The λόφος Ἄττυος was very near to this place Laneion, which shows the identity of the religious names throughout Lydia and Mysia (Or. xxv. p. 318). About the Phrygians, Aristeidês, Orat. xlv. p. 308, τῶν δὲ πλουσίων ἕνεκα εἰς τὴν ὑπερορίαν ἀπαίρουσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ Φρυγὲς τῶν ἐλαῶν ἕνεκα τῆς συλλογῆς.

The declamatory prolixities of Aris-

conception of a Phrygian or a Lydian was associated in the Greek mind with ideas of contempt and servitude,¹ to which unquestionably these Asiatics became fashioned, since it was habitual with them under the Roman empire to sell their own children into slavery²—a practice certainly very rare among the Greeks, even when they too had become confounded among the mass of subjects of imperial Rome. But we may fairly assume that this association of contempt with the name of a Phrygian or a Lydian did not prevail during the early period of Grecian Asiatic settlement, or even in the time of Alkman, Mimnermus, or Sappho, down to 600 B.C. We first trace evidence of it in a fragment of Hippônax. It began with the subjection of Asia Minor generally, first under Cræsus³ and then under Cyrus, and with the sentiment of comparative pride which grew up afterwards in the minds of European Greeks. The native Phrygian tribes along the Propontis, with whom the Greek colonists came in contact—Bebrykians, Doliones, Mygdonians, &c.—seem to have been agricultural, cattle-breeding, and horse-breeding; yet more vehement and warlike than the Phrygians of the interior, as far at least as can be made out by their legends. The brutal but gigantic Amykus son of Poseidôn, chief of the Bebrykians, with whom Pollux contends in boxing—and his brother Mygdôn to whom Hêraklês is opposed—are samples of a people whom the Greek poets considered ferocious, and not submissive;⁴ while the celebrity of the horses of Erichthonius, Laomedôn, and Asius of Arisbê, in the Iliad, shows that horse-breeding was a distinguishing attribute of the region of Ida, not less in the mind of Homer than in that of Virgil.⁵

teidês offer little reward to the reader except these occasional valuable evidences of existing custom.

¹ Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27. 'Ἀνδράποδ' ἐκ Φρυγίας, &c., the saying ascribed to Sokratês in Ælian, V. H. x. 14; Euripid. Alcest. 691; Xenophon, Agesilaus, i. 21; Strabo, vii. p. 304; Polyb. iv. 38. The Thracians sold their children into slavery—(Herod. v. 6) as the Circassians do at present (Clarke's Travels, vol. i. p. 378).

Δειλότερος λόγος Φρυγὸς was a Greek proverb (Strabo, i. p. 36; compare Cicero pro Flacco, c. 27).

² Philostrat. Vit. Apollon. viii. 7, 12, p. 346. The slave-merchants seem to have visited Thessaly, and to have bought slaves at Pagassæ; these were either Penests sold by their masters out of the country, or perhaps non-

Greeks procured from the borderers in the interior (Aristoph. Plutus, 521; Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27. Αἱ Παγασαὶ δούλους καὶ στιγματίας παρέχουσι.

³ Phrygian slaves seem to have been numerous at Milêtus in the time of Hippônax, Frag. 36, ed. Bergk:—

Καὶ τοὺς σολοίκους, ἣν λάβωσι, περνᾶσιν,
Φρυγίας μὲν ἐς Μίλητον ἀλφιτεύοντας.

⁴ Theocrit. Idyll. xxii. 47–133; Apollon. Rhod. i. 937–954; ii. 5–140; Valer. Flacc. iv. 100; Apollodôr. ii. 5, 9.

⁵ Iliad. ii. 138; xii. 97; xx. 219; Virgil, Georgic, iii. 270:—

"Ilas ducit amor (equas) trans Gargara, transque sonantem
Ascanium," &c.

Klausen (Æneas und die Penates, vol. i. pp. 52–56, 102–107) has put

DOMINICA COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY

According to the legend of the Phrygian town of Gordium on the river Sangarius, the primitive Phrygian king Gordius was originally a poor husbandman, upon the yoke of whose team, as he one day tilled his field, an eagle perched and posted himself. Astonished at this portent, he consulted the Telumisean augurs to know what it meant, when a maiden of the prophetic breed acquainted him that the kingdom was destined to his family. He espoused her, and the offspring of the marriage was Midas. Sedition afterwards breaking out among the Phrygians, they were directed by an oracle, as the only means of tranquillity, to choose for themselves as king the man whom they should first see approaching in a waggon. Gordius and Midas happened to be then coming into the town in their waggon, and the crown was conferred upon them. Their waggon, consecrated in the citadel of Gordium to Zeus Basileus, became celebrated from the insoluble knot whereby the yoke was attached, and from the severance of it afterwards by the sword of Alexander the Great. Whosoever could untie the knot, to him the kingdom of Asia was portended, and Alexander was the first whose sword both fulfilled the condition and realised the prophecy.¹

Of these legendary Phrygian names and anecdotes we can make no use for historical purposes. We know nothing of any Phrygian kings, during the historical times; but Herodotus tells us of a certain Midas son of Gordius, king of Phrygia, who was the first foreign sovereign that ever sent offerings to the Delphian temple, anterior to Gygês of Lydia. This Midas dedicated to the Delphian god the throne on which he was in the habit of sitting to administer justice. Chronologers have referred the incident to a Phrygian king Midas placed by Eusebius in the tenth Olympiad—a supposition which there are no means of verifying.² There may have been a real Midas king of Gordium; but that there was ever any great united Phrygian monarchy, we have not the least ground for supposing. The name Gordius son of Midas again appears in the legend of Crœsus and Solon told by Herodotus, as part of the genealogy of the ill-fated prince Adrastus: here too it seems to represent a legendary rather than a real person.³

Of the Lydians I shall speak in the following chapter.

together with great erudition all the legendary indications respecting these regions.

¹ Arrian, ii. 3; Justin, xi. 7.

According to another tale, Midas was

son of the Great Mother herself (Plutarch, Cæsar, 9; Hygin. fab. 191).

² Herodot. i. 14, with Wesseling's note.

³ Herodot. i. 34.

CHAPTER XVII.

LYDIANS.—MEDES.—CIMMERIANS.—SCYTHIANS.

THE early relations between the Lydians and the Asiatic Greeks, anterior to the reign of Gygês, are not better known to us than those of the Phrygians. Their native music became partly incorporated with the Greek, as the Phrygian music was; to which it was very analogous, both in instruments and in character, though the Lydian mode was considered by the ancients as more effeminate and enervating. The flute was used alike by Phrygians and Lydians, passing from both of them to the Greeks. But the *magadis* or *pectis* (a harp with sometimes as many as twenty strings, sounded two together in octave) is said to have been borrowed by the Lesbian Terpander from the Lydian banquets.¹ The flute-players who acquired esteem among the early Asiatic Greeks were often Phrygian or Lydian slaves; and even the poet Alkman, who gained for himself permanent renown among the Greek lyric poets, though not a slave born at Sardis, as is sometimes said, was probably of Lydian extraction.

Lydians—
their music
and instru-
ments.

It has been already mentioned that Homer knows nothing of Lydia or Lydians. He names Mæonians in juxtaposition with Karians, and we are told by Herodotus that the people once called Mæonian received the new appellation of Lydian from Lydus son of Atys. Sardis, whose almost inexpugnable citadel was situated on a precipitous rock on the northern side of the ridge of Tmôlus, overhanging the plain of the river Hermus, was the capital of the Lydian kings. It is not named by Homer, though he mentions both Tmôlus and the neighbouring Gygæan lake: the fortification of it was ascribed to an old Lydian king named Mêlês, and strange legends were told concerning it.² Its possessors were enriched by the neighbourhood of the river Paktôlus, which flowed down from Mount Tmôlus towards the Hermus, bringing considerable quantities of gold in its sands. To this cause historians often ascribed the abundant

They and
their capital
Sardis un-
known to
Homer.

¹ Pindar. ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. 635; | 626; Pausan. ix. 5, 4.
compare Telestês ap. Athenæ. xiv. p. | ² Herodot. i. 84.

treasure belonging to Crœsus and his predecessors. But Crœsus possessed, besides, other mines near Pergamus;¹ while another cause of wealth is also to be found in the general industry of the Lydian people, which the circumstances mentioned respecting them seem to attest. They were the first people (according to Herodotus) who ever carried on retail trade; and the first to coin money of gold and silver.²

The archæologists of Sardis in the time of Herodotus (a century after the Persian conquest) carried very far back the antiquity of the Lydian monarchy, by means of a series of names which are in great part, if not altogether, divine and heroic. Herodotus gives us first Manês, Atys, and Lydus—next a line of kings beginning with Hêraklês, twenty-two in number, succeeding each other from father to son and lasting for 505 years. The first of this line of Herakleid kings was Agrôn, descended from Hêraklês in the fourth generation—Hêraklês, Alkæus, Ninus, Bêlus, and Agrôn. The twenty-second prince of this Herakleid family, after an uninterrupted succession of father and son during 505 years, was Kandaulês, called by the Greeks Myrsilus the son of Myrsus. With him the dynasty ended, and ended by one of those curious incidents which Herodotus has narrated with his usual dramatic, yet unaffected, emphasis. It was the divine will that Kandaulês should be destroyed, and he lost his rational judgement. Having a wife the most beautiful woman in Lydia, his vanity could not be satisfied without exhibiting her naked person to Gygês son of Daskylus, his principal confidant and the commander of his guards. In spite of the vehement repugnance of Gygês, this resolution was executed; but the wife became aware of the inexpiable affront, and took her measures to avenge it. Surrounded by her most faithful domestics, she sent for Gygês, and addressed him,—“Two ways are now open to thee, Gygês: take which thou wilt. Either kill Kandaulês, wed me, and acquire the kingdom of Lydia—or else thou must at once perish. For thou hast seen forbidden things, and either thou, or the man who contrived it for thee, must die.” Gygês in vain entreated to be spared so terrible an alternative: he was driven to the option, and he chose that which promised safety to himself.³ The queen, planting him in ambush behind the bed-chamber door, in the very spot where Kandaulês had placed him as a spectator, armed him with a dagger, which he plunged into the heart of the sleeping king.

Early Lydian
kings.

Kandaulês
and Gygês.

¹ Aristot. Mirabil. Auscultat. 52.

² Herodot. i. 94.

³ Herodot. i. 13. αἰρέεται αὐτὸς πε-

πειῖναι—a phrase to which Gibbon has ascribed an intended irony which it is difficult to discover in Herodotus.

Thus ended the dynasty of the Herakleids; yet there was a large party in Lydia who indignantly resented the death of Kandaülès, and took arms against Gygès. A civil war ensued, which both parties at length consented to terminate by reference to the Delphian oracle. The decision of that holy referee being given in favour of Gygès, the kingdom of Lydia passed to his dynasty, called the Mermnadæ. But the oracle accompanied its verdict with an intimation that in the person of the fifth descendant of Gygès, the murder of Kandaülès would be avenged—a warning of which (Herodotus innocently remarks) no one took any notice, until it was actually fulfilled in the person of Cræsus.¹

The Mermnad dynasty succeeds to the Herakleid.

In this curious legend, which marks the commencement of the dynasty called Mermnadæ, the historical kings of Lydia—we cannot determine how much, or whether any part, is historical. Gygès was probably a real man, contemporary with the youth of the poet Archilochus; but the name Gygès is also an heroic name in Lydian archæology. He is the eponymus of the Gygæan lake near Sardis. Of the many legends told respecting him, Plato has preserved one, according to which, Gygès is a mere herdsman of the king of Lydia: after a terrible storm and earthquake he sees near him a chasm in the earth, into which he descends and finds a vast horse of brass, hollow and partly open, wherein there lies a gigantic corpse with a golden ring. This ring he carries away, and discovers unexpectedly that it possesses the miraculous property of rendering him invisible at pleasure. Being sent on a message to the king he makes the magic ring available to his ambition. He first possesses himself of the person of the queen, then with her aid assassinates the king, and finally seizes the sceptre.²

Legend of Gygès in Plato.

The legend thus recounted by Plato, thoroughly Oriental in character, has this one point in common with the Herodotean, that the adventurer Gygès, through the favour and help of the queen, destroys the king and becomes his successor. Feminine preference and patronage are the cause of his prosperity. Klausen has shown³ that this “aphrodisiac influence” runs in a peculiar manner through many of the Asiatic legends, both divine and heroic. The Phrygian Midas

Feminine influence running through the legends of Asia Minor.

¹ Herodot. i. 13. τούτου τοῦ ἔπεος . . . λόγον οὐδένα ἐποιεῦντο, πρὶν δὴ ἐπετελέσθῃ.

² Plato, Republ. ii. p. 360; Cicero, Offic. iii. 9. Plato (x. p. 612) compares

very suitably the ring of Gygès to the helmet of Hadès.

³ See Klausen, Æneas und die Penaten, pp. 34, 110, &c.: compare Menke, Lydiaca, ch. 8, 9.

or Gordius (as before recounted) acquires the throne by marriage with a divinely privileged maiden: the favour, shown by Aphroditê to Anchisês, confers upon the Æneadæ sovereignty in the Troad: moreover the great Phrygian and Lydian goddess Rhea or Cybelê has always her favoured and self-devoting youth Atys, who is worshipped along with her, and who serves as a sort of mediator between her and mankind. The feminine element appears predominant in Asiatic mythes. Midas, Sardanapalus, Sandôn, and even Hêraklês,¹ are described as clothed in women's attire and working at the loom; while on the other hand the Amazons and Semiramis achieve great conquests.

Admitting therefore the historical character of the Lydian kings called Mermnadæ, beginning with Gygês about 715-690 B.C., and ending with Crœsus, we find nothing but legend to explain to us the circumstances which led to their accession. Still less can we make out anything respecting the preceding kings, or determine whether Lydia was ever in former times connected with or dependent upon the kingdom of Assyria, as Ktêsias affirmed.² Nor can we certify the reality or dates of the old Lydian kings named by the native historian Xanthus,—Alkimus, Kamblês, Adramytês.³ One piece of valuable information, however, we acquire from Xanthus—the distribution of Lydia into two parts, Lydia proper and Torrhêbia, which he traces to the two sons of Atys—Lydus and Torrhêbus; he states that the dialect of the Lydians and Torrhêbians differed much in the same degree as that of Doric and Ionic Greeks.⁴ Torrhêbia appears to have included the valley of the Kaïster, south of Tmôlus, and near to the frontiers of Karia.

With Gygês, the Mermnad king, commences the series of aggressions from Sardis upon the Asiatic Greeks, which ultimately ended in their subjection. Gygês invaded the territories of Milêtus and Smyrna, and even took the city (probably not the citadel) of Kolophôn. Though he thus however made war upon the Asiatic Greeks, he was munificent in his donations to the Grecian god of Delphi. His numerous as well as costly offerings

Distribution
of Lydia into
two parts—
Lydia and
Torrhêbia.

Proceedings
of Gygês.

¹ See the article of O. Müller in the *Rheinisch. Museum für Philologie*, Jahrgang, iii. p. 22-38; also Mövers, *Die Phönizier*, ch. xii. p. 452-470.

² Diodor. ii. 2. Niebuhr also conceives that Lydia was in early days a portion of the Assyrian empire (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 371).

³ Xanthi Fragment. 10, 12, 19, ed.

Didot; *Athenæ*. x. p. 415; Nikolaus *Damasc.* p. 36, Orelli.

⁴ Xanthi *Fragm.* 1, 2; Dionys. Halik. A. R. i. 28; Stephan. Byz. v. *Τόρρηβος*. The whole genealogy given by Dionysius is probably borrowed from Xanthus—Zeus, Manês, Kotys, Asiês and Atys, Lydus and Torrhêbus.

were seen in the temple by Herodotus. Elegiac compositions of the poet Mimnermus celebrated the valour of the Smyrnæans in their battle with Gygês.¹ We hear also, in a story which bears the impress of Lydian more than of Grecian fancy, of a beautiful youth of Smyrna named Magnês, to whom Gygês was attached, and who incurred the displeasure of his countrymen for having composed verses in celebration of the victories of the Lydians over the Amazons. To avenge the ill-treatment received by this youth, Gygês attacked the territory of Magnêsia (probably Magnêsia on Sipylus) and after a considerable struggle took the city.²

How far the Lydian kingdom of Sardis extended during the reign of Gygês, we have no means of ascertaining. Strabo alleges that the whole Troad³ belonged to him, and that the Greek settlement of Abydus on the Hellespont was established by the Milesians only under his auspices. On what authority this statement is made, we are not told, and it appears doubtful, especially as so many legendary anecdotes are connected with the name of Gygês. This prince reigned (according to Herodotus) thirty-eight years, and was succeeded by his son Ardys, who reigned forty-
His son and successor
Ardys.
 nine years (about B.C. 678-629). We learn that he attacked the Milesians, and took the Ionic city of Priênê. Yet this possession cannot have been maintained, for the city appears afterwards as autonomous.⁴ His long reign however was signalised by two events, both of considerable moment to the Asiatic Greeks; the invasion of the Cimmerians—and the first approach to collision (at least the first of which we have any historical knowledge) between the inhabitants of Lydia and those of Upper Asia under the Median kings.

It is affirmed by all authors that the Medes were originally numbered among the subjects of the great Assyrian empire, of which Nineveh (or Ninos as the Greeks call Assyrians and Medes. it) was the chief town, and Babylon one of the principal portions. That the population and power of these two great cities (as well as of several others which the Ten Thousand Greeks in their march found ruined and deserted in those same regions) is of high antiquity,⁵ there is no room for doubting. But it is noway incumbent upon a historian of Greece to entangle himself in the mazes of Assyrian chronology, or to weigh the degree of credit to which the conflicting statements of Herodotus, Ktêsias, Berosus,

¹ Herod. i. 14; Pausan. ix. 29, 2.

² Nikolaus Damasc. p. 52, ed. Orelli.

³ Strabo, xiii. p. 590.

⁴ Herodot. i. 15.

⁵ Xenophon. Anabasis. iii. 4, 7; 10, 11.

Abydênus, &c. are entitled. With the Assyrian empire¹—which lasted, according to Herodotus, 520 years, according to Ktésias, 1360 years—the Greeks have no ascertainable connection. The city of Nineveh appears to have been taken by the Medes a little before the year 600 B.C. (insofar as the chronology can be made out), and exercised no influence upon Grecian affairs. Those inhabitants of Upper Asia, with whom the early Greeks had relation, were the Medes, and the Assyrians or Chaldæans of Babylon—both originally subject to the Assyrians of Nineveh—both afterwards acquiring independence—and both ultimately embodied in the Persian empire. At what time either of them became first independent, we do not know.² The astronomical canon, which

¹ Herodot. i. 95; Ktésias, *Fragm. Assyriac.* xiii. p. 419, ed. Bahr.; Diodor. ii. 21. Ktésias gives 30 generations of Assyrian kings from Ninyas to Sardana-palus: Velleius, 33: Eusebius, 35: Syncellus, 40: Castor, 27: Cephalion, 23. See Bahr ad Ctesiam, p. 428. The Babylonian chronology of Berosus (a priest of Belus, about 280 B.C.) gave 86 kings and 34,000 years from the deluge to the Median occupation of Babylon; then 1453 years down to the reign of Phul king of Assyria (Berosi *Fragmenta*, p. 8, ed. Richter).

Mr. Clinton sets forth the chief statements and discrepancies respecting Assyrian chronology in his Appendix, c. 4. But the suppositions to which he resorts, in order to bring them into harmony, appear to me uncertified and gratuitous.

Compare the different, but not more successful track followed by Larcher (*Chronologie*, c. 3, p. 145–157).

² Here again both Larcher and Mr. Clinton represent the time, at which the Medes made themselves independent of Assyria, as perfectly ascertained, though Larcher places it in 748 B.C., and Mr. Clinton in 711 B.C. “*L’époque ne me paroît pas douteuse*” (*Chronologie*, c. iv. p. 157), says Larcher. Mr. Clinton treats the epoch of 711 B.C. for this same event, as fixed upon “*the authority of Scripture*,” and reasons upon it in more than one place as a fact altogether indisputable (Appendix, c. iii. p. 259): “We may collect from Scripture that the Medes did not become independent till after the death of Sennacherib; and accordingly Josephus (*Ant.* x. 2), having related the death of this king and the miraculous recovery of Hezekiah from sickness, adds—ἐν τούτῳ τῷ

χρόνῳ συνέβη τὴν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ Μήδων καταλυθῆναι. But the death of Sennacherib, as will be shown hereafter, is determined to the beginning of 711 B.C. The Median revolt, then, did not occur before B.C. 711; which refutes Conringius, who raises it to B.C. 715, and Valckenæer, who raises it to B.C. 741. Herodotus indeed implies an interval of some space between the revolt of the Medes and the election of Dēiokēs to be king. But these ἀναστρέφονται could not have been prior to the fifty-three years of Dēiokēs, since the revolt is limited by Scripture to B.C. 711. Again, p. 261, he says, respecting the four Median-kings mentioned by Eusebius before Dēiokēs—“If they existed at all, they governed Media during the empire of the Assyrians, as we know from Scripture.” And again, p. 280—“The precise date of the termination (of the Assyrian empire) in B.C. 711 is given by Scripture, with which Herodotus agrees,” &c.

Mr. Clinton here treats, more than once, the revolt of the Medes as fixed to the year 711 B.C. by Scripture; but he produces no passage of Scripture to justify his allegation; and the passage which he cites from Josephus alludes, not to the Median revolt, but to the destruction of the Assyrian empire by the Medes. Herodotus represents the Medes as revolting from the Assyrian empire, and maintaining their independence for some time (undefined in extent) before the election of Dēiokēs as king; but he gives us no means of determining the date of the Median revolt. When Mr. Clinton says (p. 280, *Note O.*)—“I suppose Herodotus to place the revolt of the Medes in Olymp. 17. 2, since he places the accession of Dēiokēs in Olymp. 17. 3,”—this is a conjecture of

gives a list of kings of Babylon beginning with what is called the æra of Nabonassar, or 747 B.C., does not prove at what epoch

his own: and the narrative of Herodotus seems plainly to imply that he conceived an interval far greater than one year between these two events. Diodorus gives the same interval as lasting for many generations (Diod. ii. 32).

We know—both from Scripture and from the Phœnician annals, as cited by Josephus—that the Assyrians of Nineveh were powerful conquerors in Syria, Judæa, and Phœnicia, during the reigns of Salmaneser and Sennacherib. The statement of Josephus further implies that Media was subject to Salmaneser, who took the Israelites from their country into Media and Persis, and brought the Cuthæans out of Media and Persis into the lands of the Israelites (Joseph. ix. 14, 1; x. 9, 7). We know farther that after Sennacherib, the Assyrians of Nineveh are no more mentioned as invaders or disturbers of Syria or Judæa; the Chaldæans or Babylonians become then the enemies whom those countries have to dread. Josephus tells us, that at this epoch the Assyrian empire was destroyed by the Medes—or, as he says in another place, by the Medes and Babylonians (x. 2, 2; x. 5, 1). Here is good evidence for believing that the Assyrian empire of Nineveh sustained at this time a great shock and diminution of power. But as to the nature of this diminution, and the way in which it was brought about, it appears to me that there is a discrepancy of authorities which we have no means of reconciling—Josephus follows the same view as Ktésias, of the destruction of the empire of Nineveh by the Medes and Babylonians united, while Herodotus conceives successive revolts of the territories dependent upon Nineveh, beginning with that of the Medes, and still leaving Nineveh flourishing and powerful in its own territory. Herodotus further conceives Nineveh as taken by Kyaxarès the Mede, about the year 600 B.C., without any mention of Babylonians—on the contrary, in his representation, Nitokris the queen of Babylon is afraid of the Medes (i. 185), partly from the general increase of their power, but especially from their having taken Nineveh (though Mr. Clinton tells us, p. 275, that “Nineveh was destroyed B.C. 606, as we have seen from the united testimonies of the Scripture and Herodotus, by the Medes and Babylonians”).

Construing fairly the text of Herodotus, it will appear that he conceived the relations of these oriental kingdoms between 800 and 560 B.C. differently on many material points from Ktésias, or Berosus, or Josephus. And he himself expressly tells us, that he heard “four different tales” even respecting Cyrus (i. 95)—much more respecting events anterior to Cyrus by more than a century.

The chronology of the Medes, Babylonians, Lydians, and Greeks in Asia, when we come to the seventh century B.C., acquires some fixed points which give us assurance of correctness within certain limits; but above the year 700 B.C. no such fixed points can be detected. We cannot discriminate the historical from the mythical in our authorities—we cannot reconcile them with each other, except by violent changes and conjectures—nor can we determine which of them ought to be set aside in favour of the other. The names and dates of the Babylonian kings down from Nabonassar, in the Canon of Ptolemy, are doubtless authentic, but they are names and dates only. When we come to apply them to illustrate real or supposed matters of fact, drawn from other sources, they only create a new embarrassment, for even the *names* of the kings as reported by different authors do not agree, and Mr. Clinton informs us (p. 277)—“In tracing the identity of Eastern kings, the times and the transactions are better guides than the names; for these, from many well-known causes (as the changes which they undergo in passing through the Greek language, and the substitution of a title or an epithet for the name), are variously reported, so that the same king frequently appears under many different appellations.” Here then is a new problem: we are to employ “the times and transactions” to identify the kings: but unfortunately the *times* are marked only by the succession of kings, and the *transactions* are known only by statements always scanty and often irreconcilable with each other. So that our means of identifying the kings are altogether insufficient, and whoever will examine the process of identification as it appears in Mr. Clinton’s chapters, will see that it is in a high degree arbitrary; more arbitrary

these Babylonian chiefs became independent of Nineveh: and the catalogue of Median kings, which Herodotus begins with Dêiokês, about 709-711 B.C., is commenced by Ktêsias more than a century earlier—moreover the names in the two lists are different almost from first to last.

For the historian of Greece, the Medes first begin to acquire importance about 656 B.C., under a king whom Herodotus calls Phraortês, son of Dêiokês. Respecting Dêiokês himself, Herodotus recounts to us how he came to be first chosen king.¹ The seven tribes of Medes dwelt dispersed in separate villages, without any common authority, and the mischiefs of anarchy were painfully felt among them. Dêiokês, having acquired great reputation in his own village as a just man, was invoked gradually by all the adjoining villages to settle their disputes. As soon as his efficiency in this vocation, and the improvement which he brought about, had become felt throughout all the tribes, he artfully threw up his post and retired again into privacy,—upon which the evils of anarchy revived in a manner more intolerable than before. The Medes had now no choice except to elect a king. The friends of Dêiokês expatiated so warmly upon his virtues, that he was the person chosen.² The first step of the new king was to exact from the people a body of guards selected by himself; next, he commanded them to build the city of Ekbatana, upon a hill surrounded with seven concentric circles of walls, his own palace being at the top and in the innermost. He farther organised the scheme of Median despotism; the king, though his person was constantly secluded in a fortified palace, inviting written communications from all aggrieved persons, and administering to each the decision or the redress which it required—informing himself, moreover, of passing events by means of ubiquitous spies and officials, who seized all wrong-doers and brought them to the palace for condign punishment. Dêiokês farther constrained the Medes to abandon their separate abodes and concentrate themselves in Ekbatana, from whence all the powers of government branched out. And the seven distinct fortified circles in the town, coinciding as they do with the number of the Median tribes, were probably conceived by Herodotus as intended each for one

still are the processes which he employs

for bringing about a forced harmony between discrepant authorities. Nor is Volney (*Chronologie d'Hérodote*, vol. i. p. 383-429) more satisfactory in his

chronological results.

¹ Herodot. i. 96-100.

² Herodot. i. 97. ὥς δ' ἐγὼ δοκέω, μάλιστα ἔλεγον οἱ τοῦ Δηϊόκεω φίλοι, &c.

distinct tribe—the tribe of Dêiokês occupying the innermost along with himself.¹

Except the successive steps of this well-laid political plan, we hear of no other acts ascribed to Dêiokês. He is said to have held the government for fifty-three years, and then dying, was succeeded by his son Phraortês. Of the real history of Dêiokês, we cannot be said to know anything. For the interesting narrative of Herodotus, of which the above His history composed of Grecian materials not Oriental. is an abridgment, presents to us in all its points Grecian society and ideas, not Oriental. It is like the discussion which the historian ascribes to the seven Persian conspirators, previous to the accession of Darius—whether they shall adopt an oligarchical, a democratical, or a monarchical form of government;² or it may be compared, perhaps more aptly still, to the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon, who beautifully and elaborately works out an ideal such as Herodotus exhibits in brief outline. The story of Dêiokês describes what may be called the despot's progress, first as candidate and afterwards as fully established. Amidst the active political discussion carried on by intelligent Greeks in the days of Herodotus, there were doubtless many stories of the successful arts of ambitious despots, and much remark as to the probable means conducive to their success, of a nature similar to those in the *Politics* of Aristotle: one of these tales Herodotus has employed to decorate the birth and infancy of the Median monarchy. His Dêiokês begins like a clever Greek among other Greeks, equal, free and disorderly. He is athirst for despotism from the beginning, and is forward in manifesting his rectitude and justice, “as beseems a candidate for command;”³ he passes into a despot by the public vote, and receives what to the Greeks was the great symbol and instrument of such transition, a personal body-guard; he ends by organising both the machinery and the etiquette of a despotism in the Oriental fashion, like the Cyrus of Xenophon.⁴ Only that

¹ Herodot. i. 98, 99, 100. Οικοδομηθέντων δὲ πάντων, κόσμον τότε Δηϊόκης πρῶτος ἐστὶν ὁ καταστησάμενος· μήτε ἐσιέναι παρὰ βασιλέα μηδένα, δι' ἀγγέλων δὲ πάντα χρῆσθαι, ὁρᾶσθαι δὲ βασιλέα ὑπὸ μηδενός· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐτι γελᾶν τε καὶ πύειν ἄντιον, καὶ ἅπασιν εἶναι τοῦτό γε αἰσχρόν, &c. and . . . οἱ κατάσκοποι τε καὶ κατήκοοι ἦσαν ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν τῆς ἡρχε.

² Herodot. iii. 80–82. Herodotus, while he positively asserts the genuineness of these deliberations, lets drop the intimation that many of his contem-

poraries regarded them as of Grecian coinage.

³ Herodot. i. 96. Ἐόντων δὲ αὐτονόμων πάντων ἀνὰ τὴν ἡπειρον, ὧδε αὐτὸς ἐς τυραννίδας περιῆλθον. Ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖσι Μήδοισι ἐγένετο σοφὸς, τῷ ὀνόματι ἦν Δηϊόκης . . . Οὗτος ὁ Δηϊόκης, ἐρασθεὺς τυραννίδος, ἐπόλεε τοιάδε, &c. . . . Ὁ δὲ δὴ, οἷα μνεώμενος ἀρχὴν, ἰθὺς τε καὶ δίκαιος ἦν.

⁴ Compare the chapters above referred to in Herodotus with the eighth book of the *Cyropædia*, wherein Xenophon describes the manner in which the

both these authors maintain the superiority of their Grecian ideal over Oriental reality, by ascribing both to Dēiokês and Cyrus a just, systematic and laborious administration, such as their own experience did not present to them in Asia. Probably Herodotus had visited Ekbatana (which he describes and measures like an eye-witness, comparing its circuit to that of Athens), and there heard that Dēiokês was the builder of the city, the earliest known Median king, and the first author of those public customs which struck him as peculiar, after a revolt from Assyria: the interval might then be easily filled up, between Median autonomy and Median despotism, by intermediate incidents such as would have accompanied that transition in the longitude of Greece. The features of these inhabitants of Upper Asia, for a thousand years forward from the time at which we are now arrived—under the descendants of Dēiokês, of Cyrus, of Arsakês, and of Ardshir—are so unvarying,¹ that we are much assisted in detecting those occasions in which Herodotus or others infuse into their history indigenous Grecian ideas.

Phraortês (658-636 B.C.), having extended the dominion of the Medes over a large portion of Upper Asia, and conquered both the Persians and several other nations, was ultimately defeated and slain in a war against the Assyrians of Nineveh; who, though deprived of their external dependencies, were yet brave and powerful by themselves. His son Kyaxarês (636-595 B.C.) followed up with still greater energy the same plans of conquest, and is said to have been the first who introduced any organisation into the military force—before his time, archers,

Median despotism was put in effective order and turned to useful account by Cyrus, especially the arrangements for imposing on the imagination of his subjects (καταγοητεύειν, viii. 1, 40)—(it is a small thing, but marks the cognate plan of Herodotus and Xenophon), Dēiokês forbids his subjects to laugh or spit in his presence. Cyrus also directs that no one shall spit, or wipe his nose, or turn round to look at anything, when the king is present (Herodot. i. 99; Xen. Cyrop. viii. 1, 42). Again, viii. 3, 1, about the pompous procession of Cyrus when he rides out—καὶ γὰρ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐξελάσεως ἡ σεμνότης ἡμῖν δοκεῖ μία τῶν τεχνῶν εἶναι τῶν μεμηχανημένων, τὴν ἀρχὴν μὴ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι—analogous to the Median Dēiokês in Herodotus—Ταῦτα δὲ περὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐσεμνυε τῶνδε εἵνεκεν, &c. Cyrus—ἐμφανίζων δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὅτι περὶ

πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο, μηδὲνα μῆτε φίλον ἀδικεῖν μῆτε σύμμαχον, ἀλλὰ τὸ δίκαιον ἰσχύρως ὀρῶν (Cyrop. viii. 1, 26). Dēiokês—ἦν τὸ δίκαιον φυλάσσειν χαλεπός (Herodot. i. 100). Cyrus provides numerous persons who serve to him as eyes and ears throughout the country (Cyrop. viii. 2, 12). Dēiokês has many κατάσκοποι and κατήκοοι (Herodot. *ib.*).

¹ When the Roman emperor Claudius sends the young Parthian prince Meherdatês, who had been an hostage at Rome, to occupy the kingdom which the Parthian envoys tendered to him, he gives him some good advice, conceived in the school of Greek and Roman politics,—“Addidit præcepta, ut non dominationem ac servos, sed rectorem et cives, cogitaret: clementiamque ac justitiam, quanto ignara barbaris, tanto toleratiora, capesseret.” (Tacit. Annal. xii. 11.)

spearman and cavalry had been confounded together indiscriminately, until this monarch established separate divisions for each. He extended the Median dominion to the eastern bank of the Halys, which river afterwards, by the conquests of the Lydian king Cræsus, became the boundary between the Lydian and Median empires; and he carried on war for six years with Alyattês king of Lydia, in consequence of the refusal of the latter to give up a band of Scythian Nomads, who having quitted the territory of Kyaxarês in order to escape severities with which they were menaced, had sought refuge as suppliants in Lydia.¹ The war, indecisive as respects success, was brought to its close by a remarkable incident. In the midst of a battle between the Median and Lydian armies there happened a total eclipse of the sun, which occasioned equal alarm to both parties, and induced them immediately to cease hostilities.² The Kilikian prince Syennesis, and the Babylonian prince Labynêtus interposed their mediation, and effected a reconciliation between Kyaxarês and Alyattês, one of the conditions of which was, that Alyattês gave his daughter Aryênis in marriage to Astyagês son of Kyaxarês. In this manner began the connection between the Lydian and Median kings which afterwards proved so ruinous to Cræsus. It is affirmed that the Greek philosopher Thalês foretold this eclipse; but we may reasonably consider the supposed prediction as not less apocryphal than some others ascribed to him, and doubt whether at that time any living Greek possessed either knowledge or scientific capacity sufficient for such a calculation.³ The eclipse itself, and its terrific working upon

¹ The passage of such Nomadic hordes from one government in the East to another, has been always, and is even down to the present day, a frequent cause of dispute between the different governments: they are valuable both as tributaries and as soldiers. The Turcoman Ilats (so these Nomadic tribes are now called) in the north-east of Persia frequently pass backwards and forwards, as their convenience suits, from the Persian territory to the Usbeks of Khiva and Bokhara: wars between Persia and Russia have been in like manner occasioned by the transit of the Ilats across the frontier from Persia into Georgia: so also the Kurd tribes near Mount Zagros have caused by their movements quarrels between the Persians and the Turks.

See Morier, *Account of the Iliyats or Wandering Tribes of Persia*, in the *Journal of the Geographical Society of*

London, 1837, vol. vii. p. 240, and Carl Ritter, *Erdkunde von Asien, West-Asien*, Band ii. Abtheilung ii. Abschnitt ii. sect. 8. p. 387.

² Herodot. i. 74–103.

³ Compare the analogous case of the prediction of the coming olive crop ascribed to Thalês (Aristot. *Polit.* i. 4, 5; Cicero *De Divinat.* i. 3). Anaxagoras is asserted to have predicted the fall of an aérolithe (Aristot. *Meteorol.* i. 7; Pliny, *H. N.* ii. 58; Plutarch, *Lyсанд.* c. 5).

Thalês is said by Herodotus to have predicted that the eclipse would take place “in the year in which it actually did occur” — a statement so vague that it strengthens the grounds of doubt.

The fondness of the Ionians for exhibiting the wisdom of their eminent philosopher Thalês in conjunction with the history of the Lydian kings, may be

the minds of the combatants, are facts not to be called in question; though the diversity of opinion among chronologists, respecting the date of it, is astonishing.¹

It was after this peace with Alyattês, as far as we can make out the series of events in Herodotus, that Kyaxarês collected all his forces and laid siege to Nineveh, but was obliged to desist by the

seen farther in the story of Thalês and Croesus at the river Halys (Herod. i. 75) — a story which Herodotus himself disbelieves.

¹ Consult, for the chronological views of these events, Larcher ad Herodot. i. 74; Volney, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne*, vol. i. p. 330-355; Mr. Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. i. p. 418 (Note ad B.C. 617, 2); Des Vignoles, *Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte*, vol. ii. p. 245; Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. i. p. 209.

No less than eight different dates have been assigned by different chronologists for this eclipse—the most ancient 625 B.C., the most recent 583 B.C. Volney is for 625 B.C.; Larcher for 597 B.C.; Des Vignoles for 585 B.C.; Mr. Clinton for 603 B.C. Volney observes, with justice, that the eclipse on this occasion “n'est pas l'accessoire, la broderie du fait, mais le fait principal lui-même” (p. 347): the astronomical calculations concerning the eclipse are therefore by far the most important items in the chronological reckoning of this event.

Three eminent astronomers, Francis Baily, Oltmanns, and Ideler, have fixed upon the eclipse of B.C. 610, September 30, as the only one fulfilling the conditions required by the narrative. Lastly, in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society of London for 1853, Professor Airy has inserted an elaborate article “On the Eclipses of Agathoklês, Thalês, and Xerxês,” pp. 179-200. That which he calls the “Eclipse of Thalês” (or said to have been predicted by Thalês), is the event now under discussion, described by Herodotus, i. 74. Although three such astronomers as Francis Baily, Oltmanns, and Ideler had agreed, after researches undertaken independently of each other, in fixing on the solar eclipse of 610 B.C. as the only one, within possible limits of time, which would satisfy the conditions of Herodotus—yet Professor Airy has shown strong grounds for mistrusting the lunar data on which they all proceeded. He says, “I have examined every total eclipse in Oltmanns's tables,

extending from B.C. 631 to B.C. 585, and I find only one (namely, that of B.C. 585, May 28) which can have passed near to Asia Minor. That of B.C. 610, September 30, which was adopted by Baily and Oltmanns, is now thrown north even of the *Sea of Azof*” (p. 193). It is certain, as Professor Airy assumes, that the battle described by Herodotus must have taken place somewhere in Asia Minor.

Thus stands the case about the date of this eclipse as determined by high authority upon the most correct data yet attained.

One interesting sentence I transcribe from Professor Airy, because it tends to confirm the general fact stated by Herodotus, apart from the perplexities connected with the date of the eclipse. The Professor says, p. 180:—

“Mr. Baily in the first place pointed out that *only a total eclipse* could satisfy the account of Herodotus—and that a *total eclipse would suffice*. He lived to witness the total eclipse of 1842, but he observed it from the room of a house where probably he could scarcely remark the general effect of the eclipse. I have myself seen two total eclipses (those of 1842 and 1851), being on both occasions in the open country, and I can fully testify to the sudden and awful effect of a total eclipse. I have seen many large partial eclipses, and one annular eclipse concealed by clouds; and I believe that a large body of men, intent on military movements, would scarcely have remarked on these occasions anything unusual.”

If the year 585 B.C. be recognised as the real date of the total eclipse to which Herodotus refers, we shall be forced to admit that Herodotus was mistaken in representing the battle to have taken place in the reign of Kyaxarês, who, as far as we can make out, died in 595 B.C. The battle must have taken place during the reign of Astyagês, son of Kyaxarês; and Cicero (*de Divinat.* i. 49) distinctly states that the eclipse did occur in the reign of Astyagês, while Pliny (*H. N.* ii. 12) also gives the date of the eclipse as Olymp. 48⁴, or 585 B.C.

unexpected inroad of the Scythians. Nearly at the same time, or somewhat before the time, that Upper Asia was desolated by these formidable Nomads, Asia Minor too was overrun by other Nomads—the Cimmerians—Ardys being then king of Lydia; and the two invasions, both spreading extreme disaster, are presented to us as indirectly connected together in the way of cause and effect.

The name Cimmerians appears in the *Odyssey*—the fable describes them as dwelling beyond the ocean-stream, immersed in darkness and unblest by the rays of Helios. Of this people as existent we can render no account, for they had passed away, or lost their identity and become subject, previous to the commencement of trustworthy authorities; but they seem to have been the chief occupants of the Tauric Chersonesus (Crimea) and of the territory between that peninsula and the river Tyras (Dniester), at the time when the Greeks first commenced their permanent settlements on those coasts in the seventh century B.C. The numerous localities which bore their name, even in the time of Herodotus,¹ after they had ceased to exist as a nation—as well as the tombs of the Cimmerian kings then shown near the Tyras—sufficiently attest this fact. There is reason to believe that they were (like their conquerors and successors the Scythians) a nomadic people, mare-milkers, moving about with their tents and herds, suitably to the nature of those unbroken steppes which their territory presented, and which offered little except herbage in profusion. Strabo tells us² (on what authority we do not know) that they as well as the Trêres and other Thracians, had desolated Asia Minor more than once before the time of Ardys, and even earlier than Homer.

The Cimmerians thus belong partly to legend, partly to history; but the Scythians formed for several centuries an important section of the Grecian contemporary world. Their name, unnoticed by Homer, occurs for the first time in the Hesiodic poems. When the Homeric Zeus in the *Iliad* turns his eye away from Troy towards Thrace, he sees, besides the Thracians and Mysians, other tribes whose names cannot be made out, but whom the poet knows as milk-eaters and mare-milkers.³ The same

Siege of Nineveh—
invasion of the Scythians and Cimmerians.

The Cimmerians.

The Scythians.

¹ Herodot. iv. 11-12. Hekataeus also spoke of a town *Κιμμερίς* (Strabo, vii. p. 294).

Respecting the Cimmerians, consult Ukert, *Skythien*, p. 360 *seqq.*

² Strabo, i. pp. 6, 59, 61.

³ Homer, *Iliad*, xiii. 4,—

..... Αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῷ,
Νόσφιν ἐφ' ἵπποπόλων Ὀρηκῶν καθορώμενος
αἶαν

Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων, καὶ ἀγανῶν Ἰππημολγῶν,
Γλακτοφάγων, Ἀβίων τε, δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων.

Compare Strabo, xii. p. 553.

characteristic attributes, coupled with that of "having waggons for their dwelling-houses," appear in Hesiod connected with the name of the Scythians.¹ The navigation of the Greeks into the Euxine gradually became more and more frequent, and during the last half of the seventh century B.C. their first settlements on its coasts were established. The foundation of Byzantium, as well as of the Pontic Herakleia (at a short distance to the east of the Thracian Bosphorus) by the Megarians, is assigned to the thirtieth Olympiad, or 658 B.C.² The succession of colonies founded by the enterprise of Milesian citizens on the western coast of the Euxine, seems to fall not very long after this date—at least within the following century. Istria, Tyras, and Olbia or Borysthenes, were planted respectively near the mouths of the three great rivers Danube, Dniester, and Bog: Kruni, Odëssus, Tomi, Kallatis, and Apollonia, were also planted on the south-western or Thracian coast—northward of the dangerous land of Salmydessus, so frequent in wrecks—yet south of the Danube.³ According to the turn of Grecian religious faith, the colonists took out with them the worship of the hero Achilles (from whom perhaps the œkist and some of the expatriating chiefs professed to be descended), which they established with great solemnity both in the various towns and on the small adjoining islands. The earliest proof which we find of Scythia, as a territory familiar to Grecian ideas and feeling, is found in a fragment of the poet Alkæus (about B.C. 600), wherein he addresses Achilles⁴ as "sovereign of Scythia." There were, besides, several other Milesian foundations on or near the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea) which brought the Greeks into conjunction with the Scythians—Herakleia Chersonêus and Theodosia, on the southern coast and the south-western

Grecian settlements on the coast of the Euxine.

¹ Hesiod, *Fragm.* 63-64, *Marktschefel*:—

Γλακτοφάγων εἰς αἶαν, ἀπήγναις οἴκι' ἐχόντων...
Αἰθίοπας, Διγυῖας τε, ἰδὲ Σκυθίας ἱππημολγούς.

Strabo, vii. p. 300-302.

² Raoul Rochette, *Histoire des Colonies Grecques*, tom. iii. ch. xiv. p. 297. The dates of these Grecian settlements near the Danube are very vague and untrustworthy.

³ Skymnus Chius, v. 730, *Fragm.* 2-25.

⁴ Alkæus, *Fragm.* 49, *Bergk*; *Eus-tath.* ad *Dionys. Perieg.* 306—

Ἀχιλλεῦ, ὁ τὰς (γὰς, *Schneid.*) Σκυθικὰς μέδεις.

Alkman, somewhat earlier, made mention of the Issêdones (*Alkm. Fragm.* 129, *Bergk*; *Steph. Byz.* v. Ἰσσηδόνες—he

called them Assêdones) and of the Rhipæan mountains (*Fr.* 80).

In the old epic of Arktinus, the deceased Achilles is transported to an elysium in the λευκὴ νῆσος (see the argument of the *Æthiopis* in *Düntzer's Collection of Epic. Poet. Græc.* p. 15), but it may reasonably be doubted whether λευκὴ νῆσος in his poem was anything but a fancy—not yet localised upon the little island off the mouth of the Danube.

For the early allusions to the Pontus Euxinus and its neighbouring inhabitants, found in the Greek poets, see *Ukert, Skythien.* pp. 15-18, 78; though he puts the Ionian colonies in the Pontus nearly a century too early, in my judgement.

corner of the peninsula—Pantikapæum and the Teian colony of Phanagoria (these two on the European and Asiatic sides of the Cimmerian Bosphorus respectively), and Kêpi, Hermônassa, &c. not far from Phanagoria, on the Asiatic coast of the Euxine. Last of all, there was, even at the extremity of the Palus Mæotis (Sea of Azof), the Grecian settlement of Tanais.¹ All or most of these seem to have been founded during the course of the sixth century B.C., though the precise dates of most of them cannot be named; probably several of them anterior to the time of the mystic poet Aristeas of Prokonnêsus, about 540 B.C. His long voyage from the Palus Mæotis (Sea of Azof) into the interior of Asia as far as the country of the Issêdones (described in the poem, now lost, called the Arimasbian verses), implies an habitual intercourse between Scythians and Greeks which could not well have existed without Grecian establishments on the Cimmerian Bosphorus.

Hekataëus of Milêtus² appears to have given much geographical information respecting the Scythian tribes. But Herodotus, who personally visited the town of Olbia, together with the inland regions adjoining to it, and probably other Grecian settlements in the Euxine (at a time which we may presume to have been about 450–440 B.C.)—and who conversed with both Scythians and Greeks competent to give him information—has left us far more valuable statements respecting the Scythian people, dominion, and manners, as they stood in his day. His conception of the Scythians, as well as that of Hippokratês, is precise and well-defined—very different from that of the later authors, who use the word almost indiscriminately to denote all barbarous Nomads. His territory called Scythia is a square area, twenty days' journey or 4000 stadia (somewhat less than 500 English miles) in each direction—bounded by the Danube (the course of which river he conceives in a direction from N.W. to S.E.), the Euxine, and the Palus Mæotis with the river Tanais, on three sides

Scythia as
described by
Herodotus.

¹ Compare Dr. Clarke's description of the present commerce between Tagan-rock (not far from the ancient Greek settlement of Tanais) and the Archipelago: besides exporting salt-fish, corn, leather, &c. in exchange for wines, fruit, &c., it is the great deposit of Siberian productions: from Orenburg it receives tallow, furs, iron, &c.; this is doubtless as old as Herodotus. (Clarke's Travels in Russia, ch. xv. p. 330.)

² Hekataei Fragment., Fr. 153. 168, ed. Klausen. Hekataëus mentioned the Issêdones (Fr. 168; Steph. Byz. v. 'Ισση-

δones); both he and Damastês seem to have been familiar with the poem of Aristeas: see Klausen, *ad loc.*; Steph. Byz. v. 'Υπερβόρειοι. Compare also Æschyl. Prometh. 409, 710, 805.

Hellankus also seems to have spoken about Scythia in a manner generally conformable to Herodotus (Strabo, xii. p. 550). It does little credit to the discernment of Strabo that he treats with disdain the valuable Scythian chapter of Herodotus—ἄπερ Ἑλλάνικος καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Εὐδοξος κατεφλυάμεσαν ἡμῶν (ib.).

respectively—and on the fourth or north side by the nations called Agathyrsi, Neuri, Androphagi and Melanchlæni.¹ However imperfect his idea of the figure of this territory may be found, if we compare it with a good modern map, the limits which he gives us are beyond all dispute: from the Lower Danube and the mountains eastward of Transylvania to the Lower Tanais, the whole area was either occupied by or subject to the Scythians. And this name comprised tribes differing materially in habits and civilization. The great mass of the people who bore it, strictly Nomadic in their habits—neither sowing nor planting, but living only on food derived from animals, especially mare's-milk and cheese—moved from place to place, carrying their families in waggons covered with wicker and leather, themselves always on horseback with their flocks and herds, between the Borysthenês and the Palus Mæotis. They hardly even reached so far westward as the Borysthenês, since a river (not easily identified) which Herodotus calls Pantikapês, flowing into the Borysthenês from the eastward, formed their boundary. These Nomads were the genuine Scythians, possessing the marked attributes of the race, and including among their number the Regal Scythians²—hordes so much more populous

Tribes of
Scythians.

¹ Herodot. iv. 100–101. See, respecting the Scythia of Herodotus, the excellent dissertation of Niebuhr, contained in his *Kleine Historische Schriften*, “Ueber die Geschichte der Skythen, Geten, und Sarmaten,” p. 360, alike instructive as to the geography and the history. Also the two chapters in Völcker's *Mythische Geographie*, ch. vii.–viii. sect. 23–26, respecting the geographical conceptions present to Herodotus in his description of Scythia.

Herodotus has much in his Scythian geography, however, which no comment can enable us to understand. Compared with his predecessors, his geographical conceptions evince great improvement; but we shall have occasion, in the course of this history, to notice memorable examples of extreme misapprehension in regard to distance and bearings in these remote regions, common to him not only with his contemporaries, but also with his successors.

² Herodot. iv. 17–21, 46–56; Hippokratês, *De Aëre, Locis et Aquis*, c. vi.; Æschyl. *Prometh.* 709; Justin. ii. 2.

It is unnecessary to multiply citations respecting Nomadic life, the same under such wide differences both of time and of latitude—the same with the “armen-

tarius Afer” of Virgil (*Georgic.* iii. 343) and the “campestres Scythæ” of Horace (*Ode* iii. 24, 12), and the Tartars of the present day; see Dr. Clarke's *Travels in Russia*, ch. xiv. p. 310.

The fourth book of Herodotus, the *Tristia* and *Epistolæ ex Ponto* of Ovid, the *Toxaris* of Lucian (see c. 36, vol. i. p. 544 Hemst.), and the *Inscription of Olbia* (No. 2058 in Boeckh's *Collection*), convey a genuine picture of Scythian manners as seen by the near observer and resident—very different from the pleasing fancies of distant poets respecting the innocence of pastoral life. The poisoned arrows which Ovid so much complains of in the *Sarmatians* and *Getæ* (*Trist.* iii. 10, 60, among other passages, and *Lucan.* iii. 270), are not noticed by Herodotus in the Scythians.

The dominant Golden Horde among the Tartars, in the time of Zinghis Khan, has been often spoken of. Among the different Arab tribes now in Algeria, some are noble, others enslaved: the latter habitually, and by inheritance, servants of the former, following wherever ordered (*Tableau de la Situation des Établissements Français en Algérie*, p. 393, Paris, Mar. 1846).

and more effective in war than the rest, as to maintain undisputed ascendancy, and to account all other Scythians no better than their slaves. It was to these that the Scythian kings belonged, by whom the religious and political unity of the name was maintained—each horde having its separate chief and to a certain extent separate worship and customs. But besides these Nomads, there were also agricultural Scythians, with fixed abodes, living more or less upon bread, and raising corn for exportation, along the banks of the Borysthenês and the Hypanis.¹ And such had been the influence of the Grecian settlement of Olbia at the mouth of the latter river in creating new tastes and habits, that two tribes on its western banks, the Kallippidæ and the Alazônes, had become completely accustomed both to tillage and to vegetable food, and had in other respects so much departed from their Scythian rudeness as to be called Hellenic-Scythians, many Greeks being seemingly domiciled among them. Northward of the Alazônes lay those called the agricultural Scythians, who sowed corn, not for food, but for sale.²

Such stationary cultivators were doubtless regarded by the predominant mass of the Scythians as degenerate brethren. Some historians even maintain that they belonged to a foreign race, standing to the Scythians merely in the relation of subjects³—an hypothesis contradicted implicitly, if not directly, by

Manners and
worship.

¹ Ephorus placed the Karpidæ immediately north of the Danube (Fragm. 78, Marx; Skymn. Chius, 102). I agree with Niebuhr that this is probably an inaccurate reproduction of the Kallippidæ of Herodotus, though Boeckh is of a different opinion (Introduct. ad Inscriptt. Sarmatic. Corpus Inscript. part xi. p. 81). The vague and dreamy statements of Ephorus, so far as we know them from the fragments, contrast unfavourably with the comparative precision of Herodotus. The latter expressly separates the Androphagi from the Scythians—*ἔθνος ἔδν ἰδιον καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν* (iv. 18), whereas when we compare Strabo, vii. p. 302 and Skymn. Chi. 105-115, we see that Ephorus talked of the Androphagi as a variety of Scythians—*ἔθνος ἀνδρόφαγων Σκυθῶν*.

The valuable inscription from Olbia (No. 2058 Boeckh) recognises *Μιτέλλαγες* near that town.

² Herod. iv. 17. We may illustrate this statement of Herodotus by an extract from Heber's journal as cited in Dr. Clarke's Travels, ch. xv. p. 337:—"The Nagay Tartars begin to the west

of Marinopol: they cultivate a good deal of corn, yet they dislike bread as an article of food."

³ Niebuhr (Dissertat. *ut sup.* p. 360), Boeckh (Introduct. *ut sup.* p. 110) and Ritter (Vorhalle der Geschichte, p. 316) advance this opinion. But we ought not on this occasion to depart from the authority of Herodotus, whose information respecting the people of Scythia, collected by himself on the spot, is one of the most instructive and precious portions of his whole work. He is very careful to distinguish what is Scythian from what is not. Those tribes which Niebuhr (contrary to the sentiment of Herodotus) imagines *not* to be Scythian, were the tribes nearest and best known to him; probably he had personally visited them, since we know that he went up the river Hypanis (Bog) as high as the Exampæus, four days' journey from the sea (iv. 52-81).

That some portions of the same *ἔθνος* should be *ἀποτῆρες*, and other portions *νόμαδες*, is far from being without parallel; such was the case with the Persians, for example (Herodot. i. 126^a),

the words of Herodotus, and no way necessary in the present case. It is not from them however that Herodotus draws his vivid picture of the people, with their inhuman rites and repulsive personal features. It is the purely Nomadic Scythians whom he depicts, the earliest specimens of the Mongolian race (so it seems probable¹) known to history, and prototypes of the Huns and Bulgarians of later centuries. The Sword, in the literal sense of the word, was their chief god²—an iron scimitar solemnly elevated upon a wide

and with the Iberians between the Euxine and the Caspian (Strabo, xi. p. 500).

The Pontic Greeks confounded Agathyrus, Gelônus, and Scythês in the same genealogy, as being three brethren, sons of Hêraklês by the *μυσηοπαρθενος* *Ἐχιδνα* of the Hylæa (iv. 7-10). Herodotus is more precise: he distinguishes both the Agathyrsi and Gelôni from Scythians.

¹ Both Niebuhr and Boeckh account the ancient Scythians to be of Mongolian race (Niebuhr in the Dissertation above-mentioned, *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der Skythen, Geten, und Sarmaten*, among the *Kleine Historische Schriften*, p. 362; Boeckh, *Corpus Inscriptt. Græcarum, Introductio ad Inscriptt. Sarmatic.* part xi. p. 81). Paul Joseph Schafarik, in his elaborate examination of the ethnography of the ancient people described as inhabiting northern Europe and Asia, arrives at the same result (*Slavische Alterthümer*, Prag. 1843, vol. i. xiii. 6. p. 279).

A striking illustration of this analogy of race is noticed by Alexander von Humboldt, in speaking of the burial-place and the funeral obsequies of the Tartar Tchinghiz Khan:—

“Les cruautés lors de la pompe funèbre des grands-khans ressemblent entièrement à celles que nous trouvons décrites par Hérodote (iv. 71) environ 1700 ans avant la mort de Tchinghiz, et 65° de longitude plus à l'ouest, chez les Scythês du Gerrhus et du Borysthène.” (Humboldt, *Asie Centrale*, vol. i. p. 244.)

Nevertheless M. Humboldt dissents from the opinion of Niebuhr and Boeckh, and considers the Scythians of Herodotus to be of Indo-Germanic, not of Mongolian race: Klaproth seems to adopt the same view (see Humboldt, *Asie Centrale*, vol. i. p. 401, and his valuable work, *Kosmos*, p. 491, note 383). He assumes it as a certain fact, upon what evidence I do not distinctly

see, that no tribe of Turk or Mongol race migrated westward out of Central Asia until considerably later than the time of Herodotus. To make out such a negative, seems to me impossible: and the marks of ethnographical analogy, so far as they go, decidedly favour the opinion of Niebuhr. Ukert also (*Skythien*, p. 266-280) controverts the opinion of Niebuhr.

At the same time it must be granted that these marks are not very conclusive, and that many Nomadic hordes, whom no one would refer to the same race, may yet have exhibited an analogy of manners and characteristics equal to that between the Scythians and Mongols.

The principle upon which the Indo-European family of the human race is defined and parted off, appears to me inapplicable to any particular case wherein the *language* of the people is unknown to us. The nations constituting that family have no other point of affinity except in the roots and structure of their language; on every other point there is the widest difference. To enable us to affirm that the Massagætæ, or the Scythians, or the Alani, belonged to the Indo-European family, it would be requisite that we should know something of their language. But the Scythian language may be said to be wholly unknown; and the very few words which are brought to our knowledge do not tend to aid the Indo-European hypothesis.

² See the story of the accidental discovery of this Scythian sword when lost, by Attila the chief of the Huns (Priscus ap. Jornandem de Rebus Geticis, c. 35, and in *Eclóg. Legation*, p. 50).

Lucian in the *Toxaris* (c. 38. vol. ii. p. 546, Hemst.) notices the worship of the Akinakes or Scimitar by the Scythians in plain terms, without interposing the idea of the god Arês: compare Clemen. Alexand. *Protrept.* p. 25, Syl. Ammianus Marcellinus, in speak-

and lofty platform, which was supported on masses of faggots piled underneath—to whom sheep, horses, and a portion of their prisoners taken in war, were offered up in sacrifice. Herodotus treats this sword as the image of the god Arês, thus putting an Hellenic interpretation upon that which he describes literally as a barbaric rite. The scalps and the skins of slain enemies, and sometimes the skull formed into a drinking-cup, constituted the decoration of a Scythian warrior. Whoever had not slain an enemy, was excluded from participation in the annual festival and bowl of wine prepared by the chief of each separate horde. The ceremonies which took place during the sickness and funeral obsequies of the Scythian kings (who were buried at Gerrhi at the extreme point to which navigation extended up the Borysthenês) partook of the same sanguinary disposition. It was the Scythian practice to put out the eyes of all their slaves. The awkwardness of the Scythian frame, often overloaded with fat, together with extreme dirt of body, and absence of all discriminating feature between one man and another, complete the brutish portrait.¹ Mare's milk (with cheese made from it) seems to have been their chief luxury, and probably served the same purpose of procuring the intoxicating drink called *kumiss*, as at present among the Bashkirs and the Kalmucks.²

If the habits of the Scythians were such as to create in the near observer no other feeling than repugnance, their force at least inspired terror. They appeared in the eyes of Thucydides so numerous and so formidable, that he pronounces them irresistible, if they could but unite, by any other nation within his knowledge. Herodotus, too, conceived the same idea of a race among whom every man was a warrior and a practised horse-bowman, and who were placed by their mode of life out of all reach of an enemy's attack.³ Moreover, Herodotus does not

Scythians
formidable
from num-
bers and
courage.

ing of the Alani (xxx. 2), as well as Pomponius Mela (ii. 1) and Solinus (c. 20), copy Herodotus. Ammianus is more literal in his description of the Sarmatian sword-worship (xvii. 12), "Eductisque mucronibus, quos pro numinibus colunt," &c.

¹ Herodot. iv. 3-62, 71-75; Sophoklês, *Œnomaus*—ap. Athenæ. ix. p. 410; Hippokratês, *De Aëre, Locis et Aquis*, ch. vi. s. 91-99, &c.

It is seldom that we obtain, in reference to the modes of life of an ancient population, two such excellent witnesses as Herodotus and Hippokratês about the Scythians.

Hippokratês was accustomed to see the naked figure in its highest perfec-

tion at the Grecian games: hence perhaps he is led to dwell more emphatically on the corporeal defects of the Scythians.

² See Pallas, *Reise durch Russland*, and Dr. Clarke, *Travels in Russia*, ch. xii. p. 238.

³ Thucyd. ii. 95; Herodot. ii. 46-47: his idea of the formidable power of the Scythians seems also to be implied in his expression (c. 81), καὶ ὀλίγους, ὡς Σκύθας εἶναι.

Herodotus holds the same language about the Thracians, however, as Thucydides about the Scythians—irresistible, if they could but act with union (v. 3).

speak meanly of their intelligence, contrasting them in favourable terms with the general stupidity of the other nations bordering on the Euxine. In this respect Thucydidēs seems to differ from him.

On the east, the Scythians of the time of Herodotus were separated only by the river Tanais from the Sarmatians, who occupied the territory for several days' journey north-east of the Palus Mæotis: on the south they were divided by the Danube from the section of Thracians called Getæ. Both these nations were Nomadic, analogous to the Scythians in habits, military efficiency, and fierceness. Indeed Herodotus and Hippokratēs distinctly intimate that

the Sarmatians were nothing but a branch of Scythians,¹ speaking a Scythian dialect, and distinguished from their neighbours on the other side of the Tanais chiefly by this peculiarity—that the women among them were warriors hardly less daring and expert than the men. This attribute of Sarmatian women, as a matter of fact, is well attested—though Herodotus has thrown over it an air of suspicion not properly belonging to it, by his explanatory genealogical mythe, deducing the Sarmatians from a mixed breed between the Scythians and the Amazons.

The wide extent of steppe eastward and north-eastward of the Tanais, between the Ural mountains and the Caspian, and beyond the possessions of the Sarmatians, was traversed by Grecian traders, even to a good distance in the

Tribes east
and north
of the Palus
Mæotis.

¹ The testimony of Herodotus to this effect (iv. 110–117) seems clear and positive, especially as to the language. Hippokratēs also calls the Sauromatæ ἔθνος Σκυθικόν (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi. sect. 89, Petersen).

I cannot think that there is any sufficient ground for the marked ethnical distinction which several authors draw (contrary to Herodotus) between the Scythians and the Sarmatians. Boeckh considers the latter to be of Median or Persian origin, but to be also the progenitors of the modern Slavonian family: "Sarmatæ, Slavorum haud dubie parentes" (Introduct. ad Inscr. Sarmatic. Corp. Inscr. part xi. p. 83). Many other authors have shared this opinion, which identifies the Sarmatians with the Slavi; but Paul Joseph Schafarik (Slavische Alterthümer, vol. i. c. 16) has given powerful reasons against it.

Nevertheless Schafarik admits the Sarmatians to be of Median origin, and radically distinct from the Scythians. But the passages which are quoted to prove this point from Diodorus (ii. 43), from Mela (i. 19), and from Pliny

(H. N. vi. 7), appear to me of much less authority than the assertion of Herodotus. In none of these authors is there any trace of inquiries made in or near the actual spot from neighbours and competent informants, such as we find in Herodotus. And the chapter in Diodorus, on which both Boeckh and Schafarik lay especial stress, is one of the least trustworthy in the whole book. To believe in the existence of Scythian kings who reigned over all Asia from the Eastern Ocean to the Caspian, and sent out large colonies of Medians and Assyrians is surely impossible; and Wesseling speaks much within the truth when he says, "Verum hæc dubia admodum atque incerta." It is remarkable to see Boeckh treating this passage as conclusive against Herodotus and Hippokratēs. M. Boeckh has also given a copious analysis of the names found in the Greek inscriptions from Scythian, Sarmatian and Mæotic localities (Introduct. ad Inscript. Sarmatic.), and he endeavours to establish an analogy between the two latter classes and Median names. But the analogy holds just as much with regard to the Scythian names.

direction of the Altai mountains—the rich produce of gold, both in Altai and Ural, being the great temptation. First (according to Herodotus) came the indigenous Nomadic nation called Budini, who dwelt to the northward of the Sarmatians,¹ and among whom were established a colony of Pontic Greeks intermixed with natives and called Gelôni; these latter inhabited a spacious town, built entirely of wood. Beyond the Budini eastward dwelt the Thyssa-getæ and the Jurkæ, tribes of hunters, and even a body of Scythians who had migrated from the territories of the Regal Scythians. The Issêdones were the easternmost people respecting whom any definite information reached the Greeks; beyond them we find nothing but fable²—the one-eyed Arimaspians, the gold-guarding Grypes or Griffins, and the bald-headed Argippæi. It is impossible to fix with precision the geography of these different tribes;

¹ The locality which Herodotus assigns to the Budini creates difficulty. According to his own statement, it would seem that they ought to be near to the Neuri (iv. 105), and so in fact Ptolemy places them (v. 9) near about Volhynia and the sources of the Dniester.

Mannert (Geographie der Griech. und Römer, Der Norden der Erde, v. iv. p. 138) conceives the Budini to be a Teutonic tribe; but Paul Joseph Schafarik (Slavische Alterthümer, i. 10. p. 185-195) has shown more plausible grounds for believing both them and the Neuri to be of Slavic family. It seems that the names Budini and Neuri are traceable to Slavic roots; that the wooden town described by Herodotus in the midst of the Budini is an exact parallel of the primitive Slavic towns, down even to the twelfth century; and that the description of the country around, with its woods and marshes containing beavers, otters, &c., harmonises better with Southern Poland and Russia than with the neighbourhood of the Ural mountains. From the colour ascribed to the Budini, no certain inference can be drawn: *γλαυκὸν τε πᾶν ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶ καὶ πυρρόν* (iv. 108). Mannert construes it in favour of Teutonic family, Schafarik in favour of Slavic; and it is to be remarked, that Hippokratês talks of the Scythians generally as extremely *πυρρόι* (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi.: compare Aristot. Problem. xxxviii. 2).

These reasonings are plausible; yet we can hardly venture to alter the position of the Budini as Herodotus describes it, eastward of the Tanais. For he states in the most explicit man-

ner that the route as far as the Argippæi is thoroughly known, traversed both by Scythian and by Grecian traders, and that all the nations in the way to it are known (iv. 24): *μέχρι μὲν τούτων πολλὴ περιφάνεια τῆς χώρας ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἐμπροσθεν ἐθνῶν καὶ γὰρ Σκυθῶν τινες ἀπικνέονται ἐς αὐτοὺς, τῶν οὐ χαλεπὸν ἐστὶ πωθέσθαι, καὶ Ἑλλήνων τῶν ἐκ Βορυσθένης τε ἐμπορίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ποντικῶν ἐμπορίων*. These Greek and Scythian traders, in their journey from the Pontic seaports into the interior, employed seven different languages and as many interpreters.

Völkler thinks that Herodotus or his informants confounded the Don with the Volga (Mythische Geographie, sect. 24. p. 190), supposing that the higher parts of the latter belonged to the former; a mistake not unnatural, since the two rivers approach pretty near to each other at one particular point, and since the lower parts of the Volga, together with the northern shore of the Caspian, where its embouchure is situated, appear to have been little visited and almost unknown in antiquity. There cannot be a more striking evidence how unknown these regions were, than the persuasion, so general in antiquity, that the Caspian Sea was a gulf of the ocean, to which Herodotus, Aristotle and Ptolemy are almost the only exceptions. Alexander von Humboldt has some valuable remarks on the tract laid down by Herodotus from the Tanais to the Argippæi (Asie Centrale, vol. i. p. 390-400).

² Herodot. iv. 80.

or to do more than comprehend approximately their local bearings and relations to each other.

But the best known of all is the situation of the Tauri (perhaps a remnant of the expelled Cimmerians), who dwelt in the southern portion of the Tauric Chersonesus (or Crimea), and who immolated human sacrifices to their native virgin goddess—identified by the Greeks with Artemis, and serving as a basis for the affecting legend of Iphigeneia. The Tauri are distinguished by Herodotus from Scythians,¹ but their manners and state of civilization seem to have been very analogous. It appears also that the powerful and numerous Massagetæ, who dwelt in Asia on the plains eastward of the Caspian and southward of the Issêdones, were so analogous to the Scythians as to be reckoned as members of the same race by many of the contemporaries of Herodotus.²

This short enumeration of the various tribes near the Euxine and the Caspian, as well as we can make them out, from the seventh to the fifth century B.C., is necessary for the comprehension of that double invasion of Scythians and Cimmerians which laid waste Asia between 630 and 610 B.C. We are not to expect from Herodotus, born a century and a half afterwards, any very clear explanations of this event, nor were all his informants unanimous respecting the causes which brought it about. But it is a fact perfectly within the range of historical analogy, that accidental aggregations of number, development of aggressive spirit, or failure in the means of subsistence, among the Nomadic tribes of the Asiatic plains, have brought on the civilised nations of Southern Europe calamitous invasions of which the primary moving cause was remote and unknown. Sometimes a weaker tribe, flying before a stronger, has been in this manner precipitated upon the territory of a richer and less military population, so that an impulse originating in the distant plains of Central Tartary has been propagated until it reached the southern extremity of Europe, through successive intermediate tribes—a phænomenon especially exhibited during the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian æra, in the declining years of the Roman empire. A pressure so transmitted onward is said to have brought down the Cimmerians and Scythians upon the more southerly regions of Asia. The most

¹ Herodot. iv. 99–101. Dionysius Periêgêtês seems to identify Cimmerians and Tauri (v. 168: compare v. 680, where the Cimmerians are placed on the Asiatic side of the Cimmerian Bosphorus, adjacent to the Sindi).

² Herodot. i. 202. Strabo compares the inroads of the Sakæ, which was the name applied by the Persians to the Scythians, to those of the Cimmerians and the Trêres (xi. p. 511–512).

ancient story in explanation of this incident seems to have been contained in the epic poem (now lost) called *Arimaspiæ*, of the mystic Aristeas of Prokonnesus, composed apparently about 540 B.C. This poet, under the inspiration of Apollo,¹ undertook a pilgrimage to visit the sacred Hyperboreans (especial votaries of that god) in their elysium beyond the Rhipæan mountains; but he did not reach farther than the Issêdones. According to him, the movement, whereby the Cimmerians had been expelled from their possessions on the Euxine Sea, began with the Grypes or Griffins in the extreme north—the sacred character of the Hyperboreans beyond was incompatible with aggression or bloodshed. The Grypes invaded the Arimaspians, who on their part assailed their neighbours the Issêdones.² These latter moved southward or westward and drove the Scythians across the Tanais; while the Scythians, carried forward by this onset, expelled the Cimmerians from their territories along the Palus Mæotis and the Euxine.

We see thus that Aristeas referred the attack of the Scythians upon the Cimmerians to a distant impulse proceeding in the first instance from the Grypes or Griffins. But Herodotus had heard it explained in another way which he seems to think more correct—the Scythians, originally occupants of Asia, or the regions east of the Caspian, had been driven across the Araxês, in consequence of an unsuccessful war with the Massagetæ, and precipitated upon the Cimmerians in Europe.³

Cimmerians
driven out of
their country
by the
Scythians.

When the Scythian host approached, the Cimmerians were not agreed among themselves whether to resist or retire. The majority of the people were dismayed and wished to evacuate the territory, while the kings of the different tribes resolved to fight and perish at home. Those who were animated with such fierce despair, divided themselves along with the kings into two equal bodies, and perished by each other's hands near the river Tyras, where the sepulchres of the kings were yet shown in the time of Herodotus.⁴ The mass of the Cimmerians fled and abandoned their country to the Scythians; who, however, not content with possession of the country, followed the fugitives across the Cimmerian Bosphorus from west to east, under the command of their prince Madyês son of Protothyês. The Cimmerians, coasting along the east of the Euxine Sea and passing to the west of Mount Caucasus, made their

¹ Herodot. iv. 13. φοιβολαμπτὸς γε-
νομένος.

² Herodot. iv. 13.

³ Herodot. iv. 11. 'Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλος

λόγος, ἔχων ὧδε, τῷ μάλιστα λεγομένῳ
αὐτὸς προσκείμεναι.

⁴ Herodot. iv. 11.

way first into Kolchis, and next into Asia Minor, where they established themselves on the peninsula on the northern coast, near the site of the subsequent Grecian city of Sinôpê. But the Scythian pursuers, mistaking the course taken by the fugitives, followed the more circuitous route east of Mount Caucasus near to the Caspian Sea ;¹ which brought them, not into Asia Minor, but into Media. Both Asia Minor and Media became thus exposed nearly at the same time to the ravages of northern Nomades.

These two stories, representing the belief of Herodotus and Aristæas, involve the assumption that the Scythians were comparatively recent immigrants into the territory between the Ister and the Palus Mæotis. But the legends of the Scythians themselves, as well as those of the Pontic Greeks, imply the contrary of this assumption ; and describe the Scythians as primitive and indigenous inhabitants of the country. Both legends are so framed as to explain a triple division, which probably may have prevailed, of the Scythian aggregate nationality, traced up to three heroic brothers : both also agree in awarding the predominance to the youngest brother of the three,² though, in other respects, the names and incidents of the two are altogether different. The Scythians called themselves Skoloti.

Such material differences, in the various accounts given to Herodotus of the Scythian and Cimmerian invasions of Asia, are by no means wonderful, seeing that nearly two centuries had elapsed between that event and his visit to the Pontus. That the Cimmerians (perhaps the northernmost portion of the great Thracian name and conterminous with the Getæ on the Danube) were the previous tenants of much of the territory between the Ister and the Palus Mæotis, and that they were expelled in the seventh century B.C. by the Scythians, we may follow Herodotus in believing. But Niebuhr has shown that there is great intrinsic improbability in his narrative of the march of the Cimmerians into Asia Minor, and in the pursuit of these fugitives by the Scythians. That the latter would pursue at all, when an extensive territory was abandoned to them without resistance, is hardly supposable : that they would pursue and mistake their way, is still more difficult to believe : nor can we overlook the great difficulties of the road and the Caucasian passes, in the route

Difficulties
in the nar-
rative of
Herodotus.

¹ Herodot. iv. 1-12.

² Herodot. iv. 5-9. At this day, the three great tribes of the Nomadic Turcomans, on the north-eastern border of Persia near the Oxus—the Yamud, the

Gokla, and the Tuka—assert for themselves a legendary genealogy deduced from three brothers (Frazer, Narrative of a Journey in Khorasan, p. 258).

ascribed to the Cimmerians.¹ Niebuhr supposes the latter to have marched into Asia Minor by the western side of the Euxine and across the Thracian Bosphorus, after having been defeated in a decisive battle by the Scythians near the river Tyras, where their last kings fell and were interred.² Though this is both an easier route, and more in accordance with the analogy of other occupants expelled from the same territory, we must, in the absence of positive evidence, treat the point as unauthenticated.

The inroad of the Cimmerians into Asia Minor was doubtless connected with their expulsion from the northern coast of the Euxine by the Scythians, but we may well doubt whether it was at all connected (as Herodotus had been told that it was) with the invasion of Media by the Scythians, except as happening near about the same time. The same great evolution of Scythian power, or propulsion by other tribes behind, may have occasioned both events,—brought about by different bodies of Scythians, but nearly contemporaneous.

Herodotus tells us two facts respecting the Cimmerian immigrants into Asia Minor. They committed destructive, though transient, ravages in many parts of Paphlagonia, Phrygia, Lydia, and Ionia—and they occupied permanently the northern peninsula,³ whereon the Greek city of Sinôpê was afterwards planted. Had the elegies of the contemporary Ephesian poet Kallinus been preserved, we should have known better how to appreciate these trying times. He strove to keep alive the energy of his countrymen against the formidable invaders.⁴ From later

¹ Read the description of the difficult escape of Mithridates Eupator, with a mere handful of men from Pontus to Bosphorus by this route, between the western edge of Caucasus and the Euxine (Strabo, xi. p. 495–496)—*ἡ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ζυγῶν καὶ Ἡνιόχων παραλία*—all piratical and barbarous tribes—*τῇ παραλίᾳ χαλεπῶς ᾔει, τὰ πολλὰ ἐμβαλόντων ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν*: compare Plutarch, Pompeius, c. 34. Pompey thought the route unfit for his march.

To suppose the Cimmerian tribes with their waggons passing along such a track would require strong positive evidence. According to Ptolemy, however, there were two passes over the range of Caucasus—the Caucasian or Albanian gates, near Derbend and the Caspian, and the Sarmatian gates, considerably more to the westward (Ptolemy, Geogr. v. 9; Forbiger, Handbuch der Alten Geographie, vol. ii. sect. 56,

p. 55). It is not impossible that the Cimmerians may have followed the westernmost, and the Scythians the easternmost, of these two passes; but the whole story is certainly very improbable.

² See Niebuhr's Dissertation above referred to, p. 366–367. A reason for supposing that the Cimmerians came into Asia Minor from the west and not from the east, is, that we find them so much confounded with the Thracian Trêres, indicating seemingly a joint invasion.

³ Herodot. i. 6–15; iv. 12. *φαίνονται δὲ οἱ Κιμμέριοι, φεύγοντες ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην τοὺς Σκύθας καὶ τὴν Χερσόνησον κτίσαντες, ἐν τῇ νῦν Σινώπῃ πόλιν Ἑλληνισθῆναι*.

⁴ Kallinus, Fragment, 2, 3, ed. Bergk. *Νῦν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοέργων* (Strabo, xiii. p. 627: xiv. 633–647). O. Müller (History of the

authors (who probably had these poems before them) we learn that the Cimmerian host, having occupied the Lydian chief town Sardis

Literature of Ancient Greece, ch. x. s. 4) and Mr. Clinton (*Fasti Hellenici*, B.C. 716-635) may be consulted about the obscure chronology of these events. The "Scythico-Cimmerian invasion of Asia, to which *Herodotus* alludes, appears fixed for some date in the reign of Ardys the Lydian, 640-629 B.C., and may stand for 635 B.C. as Mr. Clinton puts it. O. Müller is right, I think, in stating that the fragment of the poet Kallinus above cited alludes to *this* invasion; for the supposition of Mr. Clinton that Kallinus here alludes to an invasion past and not present, appears to be excluded by the word *νῦν*. Mr. Clinton places both Kallinus and Archilochus (in my judgement) half a century too high; for I agree with O. Müller in disbelieving the story told by Pliny of the picture sold by Bularchus to Kandaulês. O. Müller follows Strabo (i. p. 61) in calling Madys a Cimmerian prince who drove the Trêres out of Asia Minor; whereas *Herodotus* mentions him as the *Scythian* prince who drove the Cimmerians out of their own territory into Asia Minor (i. 103).

The chronology of *Herodotus* is intelligible and consistent with itself: that of Strabo we cannot settle, when he speaks of many different invasions. Nor does his language give us the smallest reason to suppose that he was in possession of any means of determining dates for these early times—nothing at all calculated to justify the positive chronology which Mr. Clinton deduces from him: compare *Fasti Hellenici*, B.C. 635, 629, 617. Strabo says, after affirming that Homer knew both the name and the reality of the Cimmerians (i. p. 6; iii. p. 149)—*καὶ γὰρ καθ' Ὅμηρον, ἣ πρὸ αὐτοῦ μικρὸν, λέγουσι τὴν τῶν Κιμμερίων ἐξοδὸν γενοῦσθαι τὴν μέχρι τῆς Αἰολίδος καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίας*—"which places the first appearance of the Cimmerians in Asia Minor a century at least before the Olympiad of Corebus" (says Mr. Clinton). But what means could Strabo have had to chronologise events as happening at or a little before the time of Homer? No date in the Grecian world was so contested, or so indeterminable, as the time of Homer: nor will it do to reason, as Mr. Clinton does, *i. e.* to take the latest date fixed for Homer among many, and then to say that the invasion

of the Cimmerians *must be at least* B.C. 876: thus assuming it as a certainty, that whether the date of Homer be a century earlier or later, the invasion of the Cimmerians must be made to fit it. When Strabo employs such untrustworthy chronological standards, he only shows us (what everything else confirms) that there existed no tests of any value for events of that early date in the Grecian world.

Mr. Clinton announces this ante-Homeric calculation as a chronological certainty: "The Cimmerians first appeared in Asia Minor about a century before B.C. 776. An irruption is recorded in B.C. 782. Their last inroad was in B.C. 635. The settlement of Ambrôn (the Milesian, at Sinôpê) may be placed at about B.C. 782, twenty-six years before the æra assigned to (the Milesian or Sinôpic settlement of) Trapezus."

On what authority does Mr. Clinton assert that a Cimmerian irruption was recorded in B.C. 782? Simply on the following passage of Orosius, which he cites at B.C. 635:—"Anno ante urbem conditam tricesimo—Tunc etiam *Amazonum gentis et Cimmeriorum* in Asiam repentinus incursus plurimum diu lateque vastationem et stragem intulit." If this authority of Orosius is to be trusted, we ought to say that the invasion of the Amazons was a recorded fact. To treat a fact mentioned in Orosius (an author of the fourth century after Christ) and referred to B.C. 782, as a recorded fact, confounds the most important boundary-lines in regard to the appreciation of historical evidence.

In fixing the Cimmerian invasion of Asia at 782 B.C., Mr. Clinton has the statement of Orosius, whatever it may be worth, to rest upon; but in fixing the settlement of Ambrôn the Milesian (at Sinôpê) at 782 B.C., I know not that he had any authority at all. Eusebius does indeed place the foundation of Trapezus in 756 B.C., and Trapezus is said to have been a colony from Sinôpê; and Mr. Clinton therefore is anxious to find some date for the foundation of Sinôpê anterior to 756 B.C.; but there is nothing to warrant him in selecting 782 B.C., rather than any other year.

In my judgement, the establishment of any Milesian colony in the Euxine at so early a date as 756 B.C. is highly

(its inaccessible acropolis defied them), poured with their waggons into the fertile valley of the Kaïster, took and sacked Magnêsia on the Mæander, and even threatened the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. But the goddess so well protected her own town and sanctuary,¹ that Lygdamis the leader of the Cimmerians, whose name marks him for a Greek, after a season of prosperous depredation in Lydia and Ionia, conducting his host into the mountainous regions of Kilikia, was there overwhelmed and slain. Though these marauders perished, the Cimmerian settlers in the territory near Sinôpê remained; and Ambrôn, the first Milesian œkist who tried to colonise that spot, was slain by them, if we may believe Skymnus. They are not mentioned afterwards, but it seems not unreasonable to believe that they appear under the name of the Chalybes, whom Herodotus mentions along that coast between the Mariandynians and Paphlagonians, and whom Mela notices as adjacent to Sinôpê and Amisus.² Other authors place the Chalybes, on several different points, more to the east, though along the same parallel of latitude—between the Mosynœki and Tibarêni—near the river Thermôdôn—and on the northern boundary of Armenia, near the sources of the Araxês; but Herodotus and Mela recognise Chalybes westward of the river Halys and the Paphlagonians, near to Sinôpê. These Chalybes were brave mountaineers, though

improbable: and when we find that the same Eusebius fixes the foundation of Sinôpê (the metropolis of Trapezus) as low down as 629 B.C., this is an argument with me for believing that the date which he assigns to Trapezus is by far too early. Mr. Clinton treats the date which Eusebius assigns to Trapezus as certain, and infers from it, that the date which the same author assigns to Sinôpê is 130 years *later* than the reality: I reverse the inference, considering the date which he assigns to Sinôpê as the more trustworthy of the two, and deducing the conclusion, that the date which he gives for Trapezus is 130 years at least *earlier* than the reality.

On all grounds, the authority of the chronologists is greater with regard to the later of the two periods than to the earlier, and there is besides the additional probability arising out of what is a suitable date for Milesian settlement. To which I will add, that Herodotus places the settlement of the Cimmerians near "that spot where Sinôpê is *now* settled," in the reign of Ardys, soon after 635 B.C. Sinôpê was therefore *not*

founded at the time when the Cimmerians went there, in the belief of Herodotus.

¹ Strabo, i. p. 61; Kallimachus, Hymn. ad Dianam, 251-260—

.... ἡλαίνων ἀλατίζεμεν ἠπεύλησε (Ἐφεσον)
 Ληγάμιν ὕβριστής, ἐπὶ δὲ στρατὸν ἱππημόλων
 Ἥγαγε Κιμμερίων, ψαμάθῳ ἴσον, οἳ ῥα παρ'
 αὐτὸν

Κεκλίμενοι ναίονσι βοὸς πόρον Ἰναχωΐνης.

* Ἀ δειλὸς βασιλεὺς ὅσον ἤλiten' οὐ γὰρ ἐμελλε
 Οὐτ' αὐτὸς Σκυθίῃδε παλίμπετες, οὔτε τις
 ἄλλος

* Οὔσων ἐν λειμῶνι Καϋστρίῳ ἦσαν ἄμαξαι,

* Ἀψ ἀπονοστήσειν.....

In the explanation of the proverb Σκυθῶν ἐρημία, allusion is made to a sudden panic and flight of *Scythians* from Ephesus (Hesychius, v. Σκυθῶν ἐρημία)—probably this must refer to some story of interference on the part of Artemis to protect the town against these Cimmerians. The confusion between Cimmerians and Scythians is very frequent.

² Herodot. i. 28; Mela, i. 19, 9; Skymn. Chi. Fragm. 207.

savage in manners ; distinguished as producers and workers of the iron which their mountains afforded. In the conceptions of the Greeks, as manifested in a variety of fabulous notices, they are plainly connected with Scythians or Cimmerians ; whence it seems probable that this connexion was present to the mind of Herodotus in regard to the inland population near Sinôpê.¹

Herodotus seems to have conceived only one invasion of Asia by the Cimmerians, during the reign of Ardys in Lydia. Ardys was succeeded by his son Sadyattês, who reigned twelve years ; and it was Alyattês, son and successor of Sadyattês (according to Herodotus), who expelled the Cimmerians from Asia.² But Strabo seems to speak of several invasions, in which the Trêres, a Thracian tribe, were concerned, and which are not clearly discriminated ; while Kallisthênes affirmed that Sardis had been taken by the Trêres and Lykians.³ We see only that a large and fair portion of Asia Minor was for much of this seventh century B.C. in possession of these destroying Nomads, who while on the one hand they afflicted the Ionic Greeks, on the other hand indirectly befriended them by retarding the growth of the Lydian monarchy.

The invasion of Upper Asia by the Scythians appears to have been nearly simultaneous with that of Asia Minor by the Cimmerians, but more ruinous and longer protracted.

Scythians
in Upper
Asia.

¹ The ten thousand Greeks in their homeward march passed through a people called Chalybes between Armenia and the town of Trapezus, and also again after eight days' march westerly from Trapezus, between the Tibarêni and Mosynœki: compare Xenophon, *Anab.* iv. 7, 15 ; v. 5, 1 ; probably different sections of the same people. The last-mentioned Chalybes seem to have been the best known, from their iron works, and their greater vicinity to the Greek ports: Ephorus recognised them (see Ephori *Fragm.* 80-82, ed. Marx) ; whether he knew of the more easterly Chalybes, north of Armenia, is less certain: so also Dionysius *Periêgêtês*, v. 768: compare Eustathius *ad loc.*

The idea which prevailed among ancient writers, of a connexion between the Chalybes in these regions and the Scythians or Cimmerians (*Χάλυβος Σκυθῶν ἄποικος*, Æschyl. *Sept. ad Thebas*, 729 ; and Hesiod. ap. Clemens. Alex. Str. i. p. 132), and of which the supposed residence of the Amazons on the river Thermôdôn seems to be one of the manifestations, is discussed in

Hoeckh, *Kreta*, book i. p. 294-305 ; and Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, vi. 2. p. 408-416 : compare Stephan. Byz. v. *Χάλυβες*. Mannert believes in an early Scythian immigration into these regions. The Ten Thousand Greeks passed through the territory of a people called Skythini, immediately bordering on the Chalybes to the north ; which region some identify with the Sakasênê of Strabo (xi. 511) occupied (according to that geographer) by invaders from Eastern Scythia.

It seems that Sinôpê was one of the most considerable places for the export of the iron used in Greece: the Sinopic as well as the Chalybic (or Chalybic) iron had a special reputation (Stephan. Byz. v. *Λακεδαιμῶν*).

About the Chalybes, compare Ukert, *Skythien*, p. 521-523.

² Herodot. i. 15, 16.

³ Strabo, xi. p. 511 ; xii. p. 552 ; xiii. p. 627.

The poet Kallinus mentioned both Cimmerians and Trêres (*Fr.* 2, 3, ed. Bergk ; Strabo, xiv. p. 633-647).

The Median king Kyaxarês, called away from the siege of Nineveh to oppose them, was totally defeated; and the Scythians became full masters of the country. They spread themselves over the whole of Upper Asia, as far as Palestine and the borders of Egypt, where Psammetichus the Egyptian king met them and only redeemed his kingdom from invasion by prayers and costly presents. In their return a detachment of them sacked the temple of Aphroditê at Askalon; an act of sacrilege which the goddess avenged both upon the plunderers and their descendants, to the third and fourth generation. Twenty-eight years did their dominion in Upper Asia continue,¹ with intolerable cruelty and oppression; until at length Kyaxarês and the Medes found means to entrap the chiefs into a banquet, and slew them in the hour of intoxication. The Scythian host once expelled, the Medes resumed their empire. Herodotus tells us that these Scythians returned to the Tauric Chersonese, where they found that during their long absence, their wives had intermarried with the slaves, while the new offspring which had grown up refused to readmit them. A deep trench had been drawn across a line over which their march lay,² and the new-grown youth defended it with bravery, until at length (so the story runs) the returning masters took up their whips instead of arms, and scourged the rebellious slaves into submission.

Little as we know about the particulars of these Cimmerian and Scythian inroads, they deserve notice as the first (at least the first historically known) among the numerous invasions of cultivated Asia and Europe by the Nomads of Tartary. Huns, Avars, Bulgarians, Magyars, Turks, Mongols, Tartars, &c. are found in subsequent centuries repeating the same infliction, and establishing a dominion both more durable, and not less destructive, than the transient scourge of the Scythians during the reign of Kyaxarês.

After the expulsion of the Scythians from Asia, the full extent and power of the Median empire was re-established; and Kyaxarês was enabled again to besiege Nineveh. He took that great city, and reduced under his dominion all the Assyrians except those who formed the kingdom of

Expulsion
of these
Nomads,
after a tem-
porary occu-
pation.

¹ Herodot. i. 105. The account given by Herodotus of the punishment inflicted by the offended Aphroditê on the Scythian plunderers, and on their children's children down to his time, becomes especially interesting when we combine it with the statement of Hippokratês respecting the peculiar incapacities which were so apt to affect the Scythians, and the religious interpreta-

tion put upon them by the sufferers (De Aëre, Locis et Aquis, c. vi. s. 106-109).

² See, in reference to the direction of this ditch, Völcker, in the work above referred to on the Scythia of Herodotus (Mythische Geographie, ch. vii. p. 177).

That the ditch existed there can be no reasonable doubt; though the tale given by Herodotus is highly improbable.

Babylon. This conquest was achieved towards the close of his reign, and he bequeathed the Median empire, at the maximum of its grandeur, to his son Astyagês, in 595 B.C.¹

As the dominion of the Scythians in Upper Asia lasted twenty-eight years before they were expelled by Kyaxarês, so also the inroads of the Cimmerians through Asia Minor, which had begun during the reign of the Lydian king Ardys, continued through the twelve years of the reign of his son Sadyattês (629–617 B.C.), and

Lydian kings
Sadyattês
and Aly-
attês — war
against Mi-
lêtus.

were finally terminated by Alyattês, son of the latter.² Notwithstanding the Cimmerians, however, Sadyattês was in a condition to prosecute a war against the Grecian city of Milêtus, which continued during the last seven years of his reign, and which he bequeathed to his son and successor. Alyattês continued the war for five years longer. So feeble was the sentiment of union among the various Grecian towns on the Asiatic coast, that none of them would lend any aid to Milêtus except the Chians, who were under special obligations to Milêtus for previous aid in a contest against Erythræ. The Milesians unassisted were no match for a Lydian army in the field, though their great naval strength placed them out of all danger of a blockade; and we must presume that the erection of those mounds of earth against the walls, whereby the Persian Harpagus vanquished the Ionian cities half a century afterwards, was then unknown to the Lydians. For twelve successive years the Milesian territory was annually overrun and ravaged, previous to the gathering in of the crop. The inhabitants, after having been defeated in two ruinous battles, gave up all hope of resisting the devastation; so that the task of the invaders became easy, and the Lydian army pursued their destructive march to the sound of flutes and harps. While ruining the crops and the fruit-trees, Alyattês would not allow the farm-buildings or country-houses to be burnt, in order that the means of production might still be preserved, to be again destroyed during the following season. By such unremitting devastation the Milesians were reduced to distress and famine, in spite of their command of the sea. The fate which afterwards overtook them during the reign of Crœsus of becoming tributary subjects to the throne of Sardis, would have begun half a century earlier, had not

¹ Herodot. i. 106. Mr. Clinton fixes the date of the capture of Nineveh at 606 B.C. (F. H. vol. i. p. 269), upon grounds which do not appear to me conclusive: the utmost which can be made out is, that it was taken during

the last ten years of the reign of Kyaxarês.

² From whom Polyænus borrowed his statement, that Alyattês employed with effect savage dogs against the Cimmerians, I do not know (Polyæn. vii. 2, 1).

Alyattês unintentionally committed a profanation against the goddess Athênê. Her temple at Assêssus accidentally took fire and was consumed, when his soldiers on a windy day were burning the Milesian standing corn. Though no one took notice of this incident at the time, yet Alyattês on his return to Sardis was smitten with prolonged sickness. Unable to obtain relief, he despatched envoys to seek humble advice from the god at Delphi. But the Pythian priestess refused to furnish any healing suggestions until he should have rebuilt the burnt temple of Athênê,—and Periander, at that time despot of Corinth, having learnt the tenor of this reply, transmitted private information of it to Thrasybulus despot of Milêtus, with whom he was intimately allied. Presently there arrived at Milêtus a herald on the part of Alyattês, proposing a truce for the special purpose of enabling him to rebuild the destroyed temple—the Lydian monarch believing the Milesians to be so poorly furnished with subsistence that they would gladly embrace such temporary relief. But the herald on his arrival found abundance of corn heaped up in the agora, and the citizens engaged in feasting and enjoyment; for Thrasybulus had caused all the provision in the town, both public and private, to be brought out, in order that the herald might see the Milesians in a condition of apparent plenty, and carry the news of it to his master. The stratagem succeeded. Alyattês, under the persuasion that his repeated devastation inflicted upon the Milesians no sensible privations, abandoned his hostile designs, and concluded with them a treaty of amity and alliance. It was his first proceeding to build two temples to Athênê, in place of the one which had been destroyed, and he then forthwith recovered from his protracted malady. His gratitude for the cure was testified by the transmission of a large silver bowl, with an iron footstand welded together by the Chian artist Glaukus—the inventor of the art of thus joining together pieces of iron.¹

Sacrilege
committed
by Alyattês
—oracle—
he makes
peace with
Milêtus.

Alyattês is said to have carried on other operations against some of the Ionic Greeks: he took Smyrna, but was defeated in an inroad on the territory of Klazomenæ.² But on the whole his long reign of fifty-seven years was one of tranquillity to the Grecian cities on the coast, though we hear of an expedition which he undertook against Karia.³ He is reported

Long reign
— death—
and sepul-
chre of Aly-
attês.

¹ Herodot. i. 20–23.

² Herodot. i. 18. Polyænus (vii. 2, 2) mentions a proceeding of Alyattês against the Kolophonians.

³ Nikolaus Damasken. p. 54, ed. Orelli; Xanthi Fragment. p. 243.

Creuzer.

Mr. Clinton states Alyattês to have conquered Karia, and also Æolis, for neither of which do I find sufficient authority (Fasti Hellen. ch. xvii. p. 298).

to have been during youth of overweening insolence, but to have acquired afterwards a just and improved character. By an Ionian wife he became father of Crœsus, whom even during his lifetime he appointed satrap of the town of Adramyttium and the neighbouring plain of Thêbê. But he had also other wives and other sons, and one of the latter, Adramytus, is reported as the founder of Adramyttium.¹ How far his dominion in the interior of Asia Minor extended, we do not know, but very probably his long and comparatively inactive reign may have favoured the accumulation of those treasures which afterwards rendered the wealth of Crœsus so proverbial. His monument, an enormous pyramidal mound upon a stone base, erected near Sardis by the joint efforts of the whole Sardian population, was the most memorable curiosity in Lydia during the time of Herodotus. It was inferior only to the gigantic edifices of Egypt and Babylon.²

Crœsus obtained the throne, at the death of his father, by appointment from the latter. But there was a party among the Lydians who had favoured the pretensions of his brother Pantaleon. One of the richest chiefs of that party was put to death afterwards by the new king, under the cruel torture of a spiked carding machine—his property being confiscated.³ The aggressive reign of Crœsus, lasting fourteen years (559-545 B.C.), formed a marked contrast to the long quiescence of his father during a reign of fifty-seven years.

Pretences being easily found for war against the Asiatic Greeks, Crœsus attacked them one after the other. Unfortunately we know neither the particulars of these successive aggressions, nor the previous history of the Ionic cities, so as to be able to explain how it was that the fifth of the Mermnad kings of Sardis met with such unqualified success, in an enterprise which his predecessors had attempted in vain. Milêtus alone, with the aid of Chios, had resisted Alyattês and Sadyattês for eleven years—and Crœsus possessed no naval force, any more than his father and grandfather. But on this occasion, not one of the towns can have displayed the like individual energy. In regard to the Milesians, we may perhaps suspect that the period now under consideration was comprised in that long duration of intestine conflict which Herodotus represents (though without defining exactly when) to have crippled the forces of the city for two generations, and which was at length appeased by a

He attacks
and conquers
the Asiatic
Greeks.

¹ Aristoteles ap. Stephan. Byz. v. | ² Herodot. i. 92, 93,
³ Ἀδραμυττειῶν. | ³ Herodot. i. 92.

memorable decision of some arbitrators invited from Paros. These latter, called in by mutual consent of the exhausted antagonist parties at Milētus, found both the city and her territory in a state of general neglect and ruin. But on surveying the lands, they discovered some which still appeared to be tilled with undiminished diligence and skill: to the proprietors of these lands they assigned the government of the town, in the belief that they would manage the public affairs with as much success as their own.¹ Such a state of intestine weakness would partly explain the easy subjugation of the Milesians by Cræsus; while there was little in the habits of the Ionic cities to present the chance of united efforts against a common enemy. These cities, far from keeping up any effective political confederation, were in a state of habitual jealousy of each other, and not unfrequently in actual war.² The common religious festivals—the Deliac festival as well as the Pan-Ionia, and afterwards the Ephesia in place of the Delia—seem to have been regularly frequented by all the cities throughout the worst of times. But these assemblies had no direct political function, nor were they permitted to control that sentiment of separate city-autonomy which was paramount in the Greek mind—though their influence was extremely precious in calling forth social sympathies. Apart from the periodical festival, meetings for special emergencies were held at the Pan-Ionic temple; but from such meetings any city, not directly implicated, kept aloof.³ As in this case, so in others not less critical throughout the historical period—the incapacity of large political combination was the source of constant danger, and ultimately proved the cause of ruin, to the independence of all the Grecian states. Herodotus warmly commends the advice given by Thalês to his Ionic countrymen—and given (to use his remarkable expression) “before the ruin of Ionia”⁴—that a common senate, invested with

Want of co-
operation
among the
Ionic cities.

Unavailing
suggestion
of Thalês—
to merge the
twelve Ionic
cities into
one Pan-
Ionic city at
Teôs.

¹ Herodot. v. 28. *κατύπερθε δὲ του-
τέων, ἐπὶ δύο γενέας ἀνδρῶν νοσήσασα τὰ
μάλιστα στάσει.*

Allyattes reigned fifty-seven years, and the vigorous resistance which the Milesians offered to him took place in the first six years of his reign. The “two generations of intestine dissension” may well have succeeded after the reign of Thrasylbulus. This indeed is a mere conjecture, yet it may be observed that Herodotus, speaking of the time of the Ionic revolt (500 B.C.), and intimating that Milētus, though then peaceable, had been for two generations at an early

period torn by intestine dissension, could hardly have meant these “two generations” to apply to a time earlier than 617 B.C.

² Herodot. i. 17; vi. 99; Athenæ. vi. p. 267. Compare K. F. Hermann, *Lehrbuch der Griech. Staats Alterthümer*, sect. 77. note 28.

³ See the remarkable case of Milētus sending no deputies to a Pan-Ionic meeting, being safe herself from danger (Herodot. i. 141).

⁴ Herodot. i. 141–170. *χρηστή δὲ καὶ πρὶν ἢ διαφθερῆναι Ἰωνίην, Θάλεω ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου γνώμη ἐγένετο, &c.*

authority over all the twelve cities, should be formed within the walls of Teôs, as the most central in position; and that all the other cities should account themselves mere demes of this aggregate commonwealth or Polis. And we cannot doubt that such was the unavailing aspiration of many a patriot of Milêtus or Ephesus, even before the final operations of Crœsus were opened against them.

That prince attacked the Greek cities successively, finding or making different pretences for hostility against each. He began with Ephesus, which is said to have been then governed by a despot of harsh and oppressive character, named Pindarus, whose father Melas had married a daughter of Alyattês, and who was therefore himself nephew of Crœsus.¹ The latter, having in vain invited Pindarus and the Ephesians to surrender the town, brought up his forces and attacked the walls. One of the towers being overthrown, the Ephesians abandoned all hope of defending their town, and sought safety by placing it under the guardianship of Artemis, to whose temple they carried a rope from the walls—a distance little less than seven furlongs. They at the same time sent a message of supplication to Crœsus, who is said to have granted them the preservation of their liberties, out of reverence to the protection of Artemis; exacting at the same time that Pindarus should quit the place. Such is the tale of which we find a confused mention in Ælian and Polyœnus. But Herodotus, while he notices the fact of the long rope whereby the Ephesians sought to place themselves in contact with their divine protectress, does not indicate that Crœsus was induced to treat them more favourably. Ephesus, like all the other Grecian towns on the coast, was brought under subjection and tribute to him.² How he dealt with them, and what degree of coercive pre-

About the Pan-Ionia and the Ephesia, see Thucyd. iii. 104; Dionys. Halik. iv. 25; Herodot. i. 143–148. Compare also Whitte, *De Rebus Chiorum Publicis*, sect. vii. p. 22–26.

¹ If we may believe the narrative of Nikolaus Damaskenus, Crœsus had been in relations with Ephesus and with the Ephesians during the time when he was hereditary prince, and in the life-time of Alyattês. He had borrowed a large sum of money from a rich Ephesian named Pamphaês, which was essential to enable him to perform a military duty imposed upon him by his father. The story is given in some detail by Nikolaus, *Fragm.* p. 54, ed. Orell.—I know

not upon what authority.

² Herodot. i. 26; Ælian, V. H. iii. 26; Polyœn. vi. 50. The story contained in Ælian and Polyœnus seems to come from Batôn of Sinopê; see Guhl, *Ephesiaca*, ii. 3. p. 26, and iv. 5. p. 150.

The article in Suidas, v. Ἀρίσταρχος, is far too vague to be interwoven as a positive fact into Ephesian history (as Guhl interweaves it) immediately consequent on the retirement of Pindarus.

In reference to the rope reaching from the city to the Artemision, we may quote an analogous case of the Kylonian suppliants at Athens, who sought to maintain their contact with the altar by

caution he employed either to ensure subjection or collect tribute, the brevity of the historian does not acquaint us. But they were required partially at least, if not entirely, to raze their fortifications; for on occasion of the danger which supervened a few years afterwards from Cyrus, they are found practically unfortified.¹

Thus completely successful in his aggressions on the continental Asiatic Greeks, Cræsus conceived the idea of assembling a fleet, for the purpose of attacking the islanders of Chios and Samos; but became convinced (as some said, by the sarcastic remark of one of the seven Greek sages, Bias or Pittakus) of the impracticability of the project. He carried his arms, however, with full success, over other parts of the continent of Asia Minor, until he had subdued the whole territory within the river Halys, excepting only the Kilikians and the Lykians. The Lydian empire thus reached the maximum of its power, comprehending, besides the Æolic, Ionic, and Doric Greeks on the coast of Asia Minor, the Phrygians, Mysians, Mariandynians, Chalybes, Paphlagonians, Thynian and Bithynian Thracians, Karians, and Pamphylians. And the treasures amassed by Cræsus at Sardis, derived partly from this great number of tributaries, partly from mines in various places as well as the auriferous sands of the Paktôlus, exceeded anything which the Greeks had ever before known.

Cræsus king
of all Asia
westward of
the Halys.

We learn, from the brief but valuable observations of Herodotus, to appreciate the great importance of these conquests of Cræsus, with reference not merely to the Grecian cities actually subjected, but also indirectly to the whole Grecian world.

"Before the reign of Cræsus (observes the historian) all the Greeks were free: it was by him first that Greeks were subdued into tribute." And he treats this event as the initial phænomenon of the series, out of which grew the hostile relations between the Greeks on one side, and Asia as represented by the Persians on the other, which were uppermost in the minds of himself and his contemporaries.

New and
important
æra for the
Hellenic
world—com-
mencing
with the
conquests of
Cræsus.

It was in the case of Cræsus that the Greeks were first called upon to deal with a tolerably large barbaric aggregate under a warlike and enterprising prince, and the result was such as to manifest the inherent weakness of their political system, from its incapacity of large combination. The separated autonomous cities

means of a continuous cord—unfortunately the cord broke (Plutarch, Solon, c. 12).

¹ Herodot. i. 141. *Ἴωνες δὲ, ὡς ἤκου-

σαν—τείχεα τε περιεβάλλοντο ἕκαστοι, &c.: compare also the statement respecting Phôkæa, c. 168.

could only maintain their independence either through similar disunion on the part of barbaric adversaries—or by superiority, on their own side, of military organisation as well as of geographical position. The situation of Greece proper and of the islands was favourable to the maintenance of such a system : not so the shores of Asia with a wide interior country behind. The Ionic Greeks were at this time different from what they became during the ensuing century. Little inferior in energy to Athens or to the general body of European Greeks, they could doubtless have maintained their independence, had they cordially combined. But it will be seen hereafter that the Greek colonies—planted as isolated settlements, and indisposed to political union, even when neighbours—all of them fell into dependence so soon as attack from the interior came to be powerfully organised ; especially if that organisation was conducted by leaders partially improved through contact with the Greeks themselves. Small autonomous cities maintain themselves so long as they have only enemies of the like strength to deal with : but to resist larger aggregates requires such a concurrence of favourable circumstances as can hardly remain long without interruption. And the ultimate subjection of entire Greece, under the kings of Macedon, was only an exemplification on the widest scale of this same principle.

The Lydian monarchy under Cræsus, the largest with which the Greeks had come into contact down to that moment, was very soon absorbed into a still larger—the Persian ; of which the Ionic Greeks, after unavailing resistance, became the subjects. The partial sympathy and aid which they obtained from the independent or European Greeks, their western neighbours, followed by the fruitless attempt on the part of the Persian king to add these latter to his empire, gave an entirely new turn to Grecian history and proceedings. First, it necessitated a degree of central action against the Persians which was foreign to Greek political instinct ; next, it opened to the noblest and most enterprising section of the Hellenic name—the Athenians—an opportunity of placing themselves at the head of this centralising tendency ; while a concurrence of circumstances, foreign and domestic, imparted to them at the same time that extraordinary and many-sided impulse, combining action with organisation, which gave such brilliancy to the period of Herodotus and Thucydides. It is thus that most of the splendid phenomena of Grecian history grew, directly or indirectly, out of the reluctant dependence in which the Asiatic Greeks were held by the inland barbaric powers, beginning with Cræsus.

Action of the
Lydian empire con-
tinued on a
still larger
scale by the
Persians.

These few observations will suffice to intimate that a new phase of Grecian history is now on the point of opening. Down to the time of Cræsus, almost everything which is done or suffered by the Grecian cities bears only upon one or other of them separately : the instinct of the Greeks repudiates even the modified forms of political centralisation, and there are no circumstances in operation to force it upon them. Relation of power and subjection exists between a strong and a weak state, but no tendency to standing political coordination. From this time forward, we shall see partial causes at work, tending in this direction, and not without considerable influence ; though always at war with the indestructible instinct of the nation, and frequently counteracted by selfishness and misconduct on the part of the leading cities.

CHAPTER XVIII.

PHENICIANS.

OF the Phenicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians, it is necessary for me to speak so far as they acted upon the condition, or occupied the thoughts, of the early Greeks, without undertaking to investigate thoroughly their previous history. Like the Lydians, all three became absorbed into the vast mass of the Persian empire, retaining however their social character and peculiarities after having been robbed of their political independence.

The Persians and Medes—portions of the Arian race, and members of what has been classified, in respect of language, as the great Indo-European family—occupied a part of the vast space comprehended between the Indus on the east, and the line of Mount Zagros (running eastward of the Tigris and nearly parallel with that river) on the west. The Phenicians as well as the Assyrians belonged to the Semitic, Aramæan, or Syro-Arabian family, comprising, besides, the Syrians, Jews, Arabians, and in part the Abyssinians. To what established family of the human race the swarthy and curly-haired Egyptians are to be assigned, has been much disputed. We cannot reckon them as members of either of the two preceding, and the most careful inquiries render it probable that their physical type was something purely African, approximating in many points to that of the Negro.¹

It has already been remarked that the Phenician merchant and

¹ See the discussion in Dr. Prichard, *Natural History of Man*, sect. xvii. p. 152.

Μελαγχρόες καὶ οὐλότριχες (Herodot. ii. 104: compare Ammian. Marcell. xxii. 16, “subfusculi, atrati,” &c.) are certain attributes of the ancient Egyptians, depending upon the evidence of an eyewitness.

“In their complexion, and in many of their physical peculiarities (observes Dr. Prichard, p. 138), the Egyptians were an African race. In the eastern and even in the central parts of Africa, we shall trace the existence of various

tribes in physical characters nearly resembling the Egyptians; and it would not be difficult to observe among many nations of that continent a gradual deviation from the physical type of the Egyptian to the strongly-marked character of the Negro, and that without any very decided break or interruption. The Egyptian language also, in the great leading principles of its grammatical construction, bears much greater analogy to the idioms of Africa than to those prevalent among the people of other regions.”

trading vessel figures in the Homeric poems as a well-known visitor, and that the variegated robes and golden ornaments fabricated at Sidon are prized among the valuable ornaments belonging to the chiefs.¹ We have reason to conclude generally, that in these early times, the Phenicians traversed the Ægean Sea habitually, and even formed settlements for trading and mining purposes upon some of its islands. On Thasos, especially, near the coast of Thrace, traces of their abandoned gold-mines were visible even in the days of Herodotus, indicating both persevering labour and considerable length of occupation. But at the time when the historical æra opens, they seem to have been in course of gradual retirement from these regions.² Their commerce had taken a different direction. Of this change we can furnish no particulars; but we may easily understand that the increase of the Grecian marine, both warlike and commercial, would render it inconvenient for the Phenicians to encounter such enterprising rivals—piracy (or private war at sea) being then an habitual proceeding, especially with regard to foreigners.

Early presence of Phenician ships in the Grecian seas—in the Homeric times.

The Phenician towns occupied a narrow strip of the coast of Syria and Palestine, about 120 miles in length—never more, and generally much less, than twenty miles in breadth—between Mount Libanus and the sea. Aradus (on an islet, with Antaradus and Marathus over against it on the mainland) was the northernmost, and Tyre the southernmost (also upon a little island, with Palæ-Tyrus and a fertile adjacent plain over against it). Between the two were situated Sidon, Berytus, Tripolis, and Byblus, besides some smaller towns³ attached to one or

Situation and cities of Phenicia.

¹ Homer, *Iliad*, vi. 290; xxiii. 740; *Odys.* xv. 116:—

.....πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, ἔργα γυναϊκῶν
Σιδονίων.

Tyre is not named either in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, though a passage in Probus (ad Virg. *Georg.* ii. 115) seems to show that it was mentioned in one of the epics which passed under the name of Homer: "Tyrum Sarram appellatam esse, Homerus docet: quem etiam Ennius sequitur cum dicit, Pœnos Sarra oriundos."

The Hesiodic catalogue seems to have noticed both Byblus and Sidon: see Hesiodi Fragment. xxx. ed. Marktscheffel, and Etymolog. Magnum, v. *Βύβλος*.

² The name Adramyttion or Atramyttion (very like the Africo-Phenician

name *Adrumêtum*) is said to be of Phenician origin (Olshausen, *De Origine Alphabeti*, p. 7, in *Kieler Philologische Studien*, 1841). There were valuable mines afterwards worked for the account of Croesus near Pergamus, and these mines may have tempted Phenician settlers to those regions (Aristotel. *Mirab. Auscult.* c. 52).

The African inscriptions, in the *Monumenta Phœnic.* of Gesenius, recognise Makar as a cognomen of Baal; and Mövers imagines that the hero Makar, who figures conspicuously in the mythology of Lesbos, Chios, Samos, Kôs, Rhodes, &c., is traceable to this Phenician god and Phenician early settlements in those islands (Mövers, *Die Religion der Phœniker*, p. 420).

³ Strabo, xvi. p. 754-758; Skylax,

other of these last-mentioned, and several islands close to the coast occupied in like manner; while the colony of Myriandrus lay far-

Peripl. c. 104; Justin, xviii. 3; Arrian, Exp. Al. ii. 16-19; Xenophon, Anab. i. 4, 6.

Unfortunately the text of Skylax is here extremely defective, and Strabo's account is in many points perplexed, from his not having travelled in person through Phenicia, Cælo-Syria, or Judæa: see Groskurd's note on p. 755, and the Einleitung to his Translation of Strabo, sect. 6.

Respecting the original relation between Palæ-Tyrus and Tyre, there is some difficulty in reconciling all the information, little as it is, which we possess. The name Palæ-Tyrus (it has been assumed as a matter of course: compare Justin, xi. 10) marks that town as the original foundation from which the Tyrians subsequently moved into the island: there was also on the mainland a place named Palæ-Byblos (Plin. H. N. v. 20; Ptolem. v. 15), which was in like manner construed as the original seat from whence the town properly called Byblus was derived. Yet the account of Herodotus plainly represents the insular Tyrus, with its temple of Héraklès, as the original foundation (ii. 44), and the Tyrians are described as living in an island even in the time of their king Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon (Joseph. Ant. Jud. viii. 2, 7). Arrian treats the temple of Héraklès in the island Tyre as the most ancient temple within the memory of man (Exp. Al. ii. 16). The Tyrians also lived on their island during the invasion of Salmaneser king of Nineveh, and their position enabled them to hold out against him, while Pylæ-Tyrus on the terra firma was obliged to yield itself (Joseph. *ib.* ix. 14, 2). The town taken (or reduced to capitulate), after a long siege, by Nebuchadnezzar, was the insular Tyrus, not the continental or Palæ-Tyrus, which had surrendered without resistance to Salmaneser. It is not correct, therefore, to say—with Volney (*Recherches sur l'Hist. Anc.* ch. xiv. p. 249), Heeren (*Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt*, part i. abth. 2. p. 11) and others—that the insular Tyre was called new Tyre, and that the site of Tyre was changed from continental to insular, in consequence of the taking of the continental Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar: the site remained unaltered, and the insular Tyrians became subject to him and his successors until the de-

struction of the Chaldean monarchy by Cyrus. Hengstenberg's Dissertation, *De Rebus Tyriorum* (Berlin, 1832), is instructive on many of these points: he shows sufficiently that Tyre was, from the earliest times traceable, an insular city; but he wishes at the same time to show, that it was also, from the beginning, joined on to the mainland by an isthmus (p. 10-25)—which is both inconsistent with the former position and unsupported by any solid proofs. It remained an island strictly so-called, until the siege by Alexander: the mole, by which that conqueror had stormed it, continued after his day, perhaps enlarged, so as to form a permanent connection from that time forward between the island and the mainland (Plin. H. N. v. 19; Strabo, xvi. p. 757), and to render the insular Tyrus capable of being included by Pliny in one computation of circumference jointly with Palæ-Tyrus, the mainland town.

It may be doubted whether we know the true meaning of the word which the Greeks called Παλαι-Τύρος. It is plain that the Tyrians themselves did not call it by that name: perhaps the Phenician name which this continental adjacent town bore, may have been something resembling Palæ-Tyrus in sound but not coincident in meaning.

The strength of Tyre lay in its insular situation; for the adjacent mainland, whereon Palæ-Tyrus was placed, was a fertile plain, thus described by William of Tyre during the time of the Crusaders:—

“Erat prædicta civitas non solum munitissima, sed etiam fertilitate præcipuâ et amœnitate quasi singularis: nam licet in medio mari sita est, et in modum insulæ tota fluctibus cincta; habet tamen pro foribus latifundium per omnia commendabile, et planitiem sibi continuam divitis glebæ et opimi soli, multas civibus ministrans commoditates. Quæ licet modica videatur respectu aliarum regionum, exiguitatem suam multâ redimit ubertate, et infinita jugera multiplici fecunditate compensat. Nec tamen tantis arctatur angustiis. Proten-ditur enim in Austrum versus Ptolemaidem usque ad eum locum, qui hodie vulgo dicitur districtum Scandarionis, milliaribus quatuor aut quinque: e regione in Septentrionem versus Sareptam et Sidonem iterum porrigitur totidem milliaribus. In latitudinem vero ubi

ther north, near the borders of Kilikia. Whether Sidon or Tyre was the most ancient, seems not determinable. If it be true, as some authorities affirmed, that Tyre was originally planted from Sidon, the colony must have grown so rapidly as to surpass its metropolis in power and consideration; for it became the chief of all the Phenician towns.¹ Aradus, the next in importance after these two, was founded by exiles from Sidon, and all the rest either by Tyrian or Sidonian settlers. Within this confined territory was concentrated a greater degree of commercial wealth, enterprise, and manufacturing ingenuity, than could be found in any other portion of the contemporary world. Each town was an independent community, having its own surrounding territory and political constitution and its own hereditary prince;² though the annals of Tyre display many instances of princes assassinated by men who succeeded them on the throne. Tyre appears to have enjoyed a certain presiding, perhaps controlling, authority over all of them, which was not always willingly submitted to; and examples occur in which the inferior towns, when Tyre was pressed by a foreign enemy,³ took the opportunity of revolting, or at least stood aloof. The same difficulty of managing satisfactorily the relations between a presiding town and its confederates, which Grecian history manifests, is found also to prevail in Phenicia, and will be hereafter remarked in regard to Carthage; while the same effects are also perceived, of the autonomous city polity, in keeping alive the individual energies and regulated aspirations of the inhabitants. The predominant sentiment of jealous town-isolation is forcibly illustrated by the circumstances of Tripolis, established jointly by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus. It consisted of three distinct towns, each one furlong apart from the other two, and each with its own separate walls; though probably constituting to a certain extent one political community, and serving as a place of common meeting and deliberation for the entire Phenician name.⁴ The outlying promontories of Libanus and Anti-Libanus touched the sea along the

minimum ad duo, ubi plurimum ad tria, habens milliaria." (Apud Hengstenberg *ut sup.* p. 5.) Compare Maundrell, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, p. 50, ed. 1749; and Volney, *Travels in Egypt and Syria*, vol. ii. p. 210-226.

¹ Justin (xviii. 3) states that Sidon was the metropolis of Tyre, but the series of events which he recounts is confused and unintelligible. Strabo also, in one place, calls Sidon the *μητρόπολις τῶν Φοινίκων* (i. p. 40); in another place he states it as a point disputed between

the two cities, which of them was the *μητρόπολις τῶν Φοινίκων* (xvi. p. 756).

Quintus Curtius affirms both Tyre and Sidon to have been founded by Agênôr (iv. 4, 15).

² See the interesting citations of Josephus from Dios and Menander, who had access to the Tyrian *ἀναγραφαί*, or chronicles (Josephus cont. Apion. i. c. 17, 18, 21; Antiqq. J. x. 11, 1).

³ Joseph. Antiq. J. ix. 14, 2.

⁴ Diodor. xvi. 41; Skylax, c. 104.

Phenician coast, and those mountainous ranges, though rendering a large portion of the very confined area unfit for cultivation of corn, furnished what was perhaps yet more indispensable—abundant supplies of timber for ship-building; while the entire want of all wood in Babylonia, except the date palm, restricted the Assyrians of that territory from maritime traffic on the Persian Gulf. It appears however that the mountains of Lebanon also afforded shelter to tribes of predatory Arabs, who continually infested both the Phenician territory and the rich neighbouring plain of Cælo-Syria.¹

The splendid temple of that great Phenician god (Melkarth), whom the Greeks called Hêraklês,² was situated in Tyre. The Tyrians affirmed that its establishment had been coeval with the first foundation of the city, 2300 years before the time of Herodotus. This god, the companion and protector of their colonial settlements, and the ancestor of the Phœnico-Libyan kings, is found especially at Carthage, Gadês and Thasos.³ Some supposed that the Phenicians had migrated to their site on the Mediterranean coast from previous abodes near the mouth of the Euphrates,⁴

¹ Strabo, xvi. p. 756.

² A Maltese inscription identifies the Tyrian Melkarth with Ἡρακλῆς (Gesevius, Monument. Phœnic. tab. vi.).

³ Herodot. ii. 44; Sallust, Bell. Jug. c. 18; Pausan. x. 12, 2; Arrian, Exp. Al. ii. 16; Justin, xlv. 5; Appian, vi. 2.

⁴ Herodot. i. 2; Ephorus, Frag. 40, ed. Marx; Strabo, xvi. p. 766–784, with Grosskurd's note on the former passage; Justin, xviii. 3. In the animated discussion carried on among the Homeric critics and the great geographers of antiquity, to ascertain *where* it was that Menelaus actually went during his eight years' wandering (Odys. iv. 85)—

.....ἡ γὰρ πολλὰ παθὼν καὶ πολλ' ἐπαληθεῖς
Ἠγαγόμην ἐν νηυσὶ, καὶ δοῦναι ἔπει ἦλθον,
Κύπρον, Φοινίκην τε, καὶ Αἰγυπτίους ἐπαληθεῖς
Αἰθίοπας τ' ἰκόμην, καὶ Σιδονίους, καὶ Ἐρεμ-
βοῦς,
Καὶ Λιβύην, &c.

one idea started was, that he had visited these Sidonians in the Persian Gulf, or in the Erythræan Sea (Strabo, i. p. 42). The various opinions which Strabo quotes, including those of Eratosthenês and Kratês, as well as his own comments, are very curious. Kratês supposed that Menelaus had passed the Straits of Gibraltar and circumnavigated Libya to Æthiopia and India, which

voyage would suffice (he thought) to fill up the eight years. Others supposed that Menelaus had sailed first up the Nile, and then into the Red Sea, by means of the canal (διωρὺς) which existed in the time of the Alexandrine critics between the Nile and the sea; to which Strabo replies that this canal was not made until after the Trojan war. Eratosthenês started a still more remarkable idea: he thought that in the time of Homer the Strait of Gibraltar had not yet been burst open, so that the Mediterranean was on that side a closed sea; but, on the other hand, its level was then so much higher, that it covered the Isthmus of Suez, and joined the Red Sea. It was (he thought) the disruption of the Strait of Gibraltar which first lowered the level of the water, and left the Isthmus of Suez dry; though Menelaus, in *his* time, had sailed from the Mediterranean into the Red Sea without difficulty. This opinion Eratosthenês had imbibed from Stratôn of Lampsakus, the successor of Theophrastus: Hipparchus controverted it, together with many other of the opinions of Eratosthenês (see Strabo, i. pp. 38, 49, 56; Seidel, Fragmenta Eratosthenis, p. 39).

In reference to the view of Kratês—that Menelaus had sailed round Africa—it is to be remarked that all the geogra-

or on islands (named Tylus and Aradus) of the Persian Gulf; while others treated the Mediterranean Phenicians as original, and the others as colonists. Whether such be the fact or not, history knows them in no other portion of Asia earlier than in Phenicia proper.

Though the invincible industry and enterprise of the Phenicians maintained them as a people of importance down to the period of the Roman empire, yet the period of their widest range and greatest efficiency is to be sought much earlier—anterior to 700 B.C. In these remote times they and their colonists were the exclusive navigators of the Mediterranean: the rise of the Greek maritime settlements banished their commerce to a great degree from the Ægean Sea, and embarrassed it even in the more westerly waters. Their colonial establishments were formed in Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, the Balearic Isles, and Spain. The greatness as well as the antiquity of Carthage, Utica, and Gadês, attest the long-sighted plans of Phenician traders, even in days anterior to the first Olympiad. We trace the wealth and industry of Tyre, and the distant navigation of her vessels through the Red Sea and along the coast of Arabia, back to the days of David and Solomon. And as neither Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, or Indians, addressed themselves to a seafaring life, so it seems that both the importation and the distribution of the products of India and Arabia into Western Asia and Europe were performed by the Idumæan Arabs between Petra and the Red Sea—by the Arabs of Gerrha on the Persian Gulf, joined as they were in later times by a body of Chaldæan exiles from Babylonia—and by the more enterprising Phenicians of Tyre and Sidon in these two seas as well as in the Mediterranean.¹

The most ancient Phenician colonies were Utica, nearly on the northernmost point of the coast of Africa and in the same gulf (now called the Gulf of Tunis) as Carthage, over against Cape Lilybæum in Sicily—and Gadês, or Gadeira, in Tartêssus, or the south-western coast of Spain. The latter town, founded perhaps near 1000 years before the Christian

Phenician commerce flourished more in the earlier than in the later times.

Phenician colonies—
Utica, Carthage, Gadês, &c.

phers of that day formed to themselves a very insufficient idea of the extent of that continent, believing that it did not even reach so far southward as the equator.

Strabo himself adopts neither of these three opinions, but construes the Homeric words describing the wanderings of Menelaus as applying only to the

coasts of Egypt, Libya, Phenicia, &c. He suggests various reasons, more curious than convincing, to prove that Menelaus may easily have spent eight years in these visits of mixed friendship and piracy.

¹ See Ritter, *Erdkunde von Asien*, West-Asien, Buch iii. Abtheilung iii. Abschnitt i. s. 29. p. 50.

æra,¹ has maintained a continuous prosperity, and a name (Cadiz) substantially unaltered, longer than any town in Europe. How well the site of Utica was suited to the circumstances of Phenician colonists may be inferred from the fact that Carthage was afterwards established in the same gulf and near to the same spot, and that both the two cities reached a high pitch of prosperity. The distance of Gadês from Tyre seems surprising, and if we calculate by time instead of by space, the Tyrians were separated from their Tartêssian colonists by an interval greater than that which now divides an Englishman from Bombay; for the ancient navigator always coasted along the land, and Skylax reckons seventy-five days² of voyage from the Kanôpic (westernmost) mouth of the Nile to the pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar); to which some more days must be added to represent the full distance between Tyre and Gadês. But the enterprise of these early mariners surmounted all difficulties consistent with the principle of never losing sight of the coast. Proceeding along the northern coast of Libya, at a time when the mouths of the Nile were still closed by Egyptian jealousy against all foreign ships, they appear to have found little temptation to colonise³ on the dangerous coast near to the two gulfs called the Great and Little Syrtis—in a territory for the most part destitute of water, and occupied by rude Libyan Nomads, who were thinly spread over the wide space between the western Nile⁴ and Cape Hermæa, now called Cape Bona. The subsequent Grecian towns of Kyrênê and Barka, whose well-chosen site formed an exception to the general charac-

¹ Strabo speaks of the earliest settlements of the Phenicians in Africa and Iberia as μικρὸν τῶν Τρωϊκῶν ὕστερον (i. p. 48). Utica is affirmed to have been 287 years earlier than Carthage (Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 134): compare Velleius Patere. i. 2.

Archaleus, son of Phoenix, was stated as the founder of Gadês in the Phenician history of Claudius Julius, now lost (Etymolog. Magn. v. Γαδεῖρα). Archaleus is a version of the name Hercules, in the opinion of Mövers.

² Skylax, Periplus, c. 110. "Carteia, ut quidam putant, aliquando Tartessus; et quam transvecti ex Africâ Phœnices habitant, atque unde nos sumus, Tingentera." (Mela, ii. 6, 75.) The expression *transvecti ex Africâ* applies as much to the Phenicians as to the Carthaginians: "*uterque Pœnus*" (Horat. Od. ii. 11) means the Carthaginians, and the Phenicians of Gadês.

³ Strabo, xvii. p. 836.

⁴ Cape Soloeis, considered by Herodotus as the westernmost headland of Libya, coincides in name with the Phenician town Soloeis in Western Sicily, also (seemingly) with the Phenician settlement *Suel* (Mela, ii. 6, 65) in Southern Iberia or Tartêssus. Cape Hermæa was the name of the north-eastern headland of the Gulf of Tunis, and also the name of a cape in Libya two days' sail westward of the Pillars of Hêraklês (Skylax, c. 111).

Probably all the remarkable headlands in these seas received their names from the Phenicians. Both Mannert (Geogr. d. Gr. und Röm. x. 2, p. 495) and Förbiger (Alte Geogr. sect. 111. p. 867) identify Cape Soloeis with what is now called Cape Cantin; Heeren considers it to be the same as Cape Blanco; Bougainville as Cape Boyador.

ter of the region, were not planted with any view to commerce;¹ while the Phenician town of Leptis, near the gulf called the Great Syrtis, was established more as a shelter for exiles from Sidon, than by a preconcerted scheme of colonization. The site of Utica and Carthage, in the gulf immediately westward of Cape Bona, was convenient for commerce with Sicily, Italy and Sardinia; and the other Phenician colonies, Adrumêtum, Neapolis, Hippo (two towns so called), the Lesser Leptis, &c., were settled on the coast not far distant from the eastern or western promontories which included the Gulf of Tunis, common to Carthage and Utica.

These early Phenician settlements were planted thus in the territory now known as the kingdom of Tunis and the eastern portion of the French province of Constantine. From thence to the Pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar) we do not hear of any others. But the colony of Gadês, outside of the Strait, formed the centre of a flourishing and extensive commerce, which reached on one side far to the south, not less than thirty days' sail along the western coast of Africa²—and on the other side to Britain and the Scilly Islands. There were numerous Phenician factories and small trading towns along the western coast of what is now the empire of Morocco; while the island of Kernê, twelve days' sail along the coast from the Strait of Gibraltar, formed an established dépôt for Phenician merchandise in trading with the interior. There were, moreover, not far distant from the coast, towns of Libyans or Ethiopians, to which the inhabitants of the central regions resorted, and where they brought their leopard skins and elephants' teeth to be exchanged against the unguents of Tyre and the pottery of Athens.³

¹ Sallust, Bell. Jug. c. 78. It was termed Leptis Magna, to distinguish it from another Leptis, more to the westward and nearer to Carthage, called Leptis Parva; but this latter seems to have been generally known by the name Leptis (Förbiger, Alte Geogr. sect. 109. p. 844). In Leptis Magna the proportion of Phenician colonists was so inconsiderable that the Phenician language had been lost, and that of the natives, whom Sallust calls Numidians, spoken; but these people had embraced Sidonian institutions and civilization (Sall. *ib.*).

² Strabo, xvii. p. 825, 826. He found it stated by some authors that there had once been three hundred trading establishments along this coast, reaching thirty days' voyage southward from Tingis (Tangier); but that they had been chiefly ruined by the tribes of the

interior—the Pharusians and Nigritæ. He suspects the statement of being exaggerated, but there seems nothing at all incredible in it. From Strabo's language we gather that Eratosthenes set forth the statement as in his judgment a true one. The text of Strabo, p. 825, as we read it, confounds Tingis with Lixus; another Phenician settlement about two days' journey southward along the coast, and according to some reports even older than Gadês. See the interesting and valuable Travels of Dr. Barth, the last describer of this now uninviting region—Wanderungen durch die Küstenländer des Mittelmeers, ch. i. p. 23–49. I had in my former edition followed Strabo in confounding Tingis with Lixus: an error pointed out by Dr. Barth, and by Grosskurd.

³ Compare Skylax, c. 111, and the

So distant a trade with the limited navigation of that day, could not be made to embrace very bulky goods.

But this trade, though seemingly a valuable one, constituted only a small part of the sources of wealth, open to the Phenicians of Gadês. The Turditanians and Turduli, who occupied the south-western portion of Spain between the Anas river (Guadiana) and the Mediterranean, seem to have been the most civilized and improveable section of the Iberian tribes, well-suited for commercial relations with the settlers who occupied the Isle of Leon, and who established the temple, afterwards so rich and frequented, of the Tyrian Hêraklês. And the extreme productiveness of the southern region of Spain, in corn, fish, cattle, and wine, as well as in silver and iron, is a topic upon which we find but one language among ancient writers. The territory round Gadês, Carteia, and the other Phenician settlements in this district, was known to the Greeks in the sixth century B.C. by the name of Tartêssus, and regarded by them somewhat in the same light as Mexico and Peru appeared to the Spaniards of the sixteenth century. For three or four centuries the Phenicians had possessed the entire monopoly of this Tartêssian trade, without any rivalry on the part of the Greeks. Probably the metals there procured were in those days their most precious acquisition, and the tribes who occupied the mining regions of the interior found a new market and valuable demand, for produce then obtained with a degree of facility exaggerated into fable.¹ It was from Gadês as a centre that these enterprising traders, pushing their coasting voyage yet farther, established relations with the tin-mines of Cornwall, perhaps also with amber-gatherers from the coasts of the Baltic. It requires some effort to carry back our imaginations to the time when, along all this vast length of country, from Tyre and Sidon to the coast of Cornwall, there was no merchant-ship to buy or sell goods except these Phenicians. The rudest tribes find advantage in such visitors; and we cannot doubt, that the men whose resolute love of gain braved so many hazards and difficulties, must have been rewarded with profits on the largest scale of monopoly.

Productive
region round
Gadês, called
Tartêssus.

Periplus of Hanno, ap. Hudson, Geogr. Græc. Min. vol. i. p. 1-6. I have already observed that the *τάριχος* (salt provisions) from Gadeira was currently sold in the markets of Athens, from the Peloponnesian war downward. — Eupolis, Fragm. 23; *Μαρικᾶς*, p. 506, ed. Meineke, Comic. Græc.

Compare the citations from the other comic writers, Antiphanês and Nikostratus ap. Athenæ, iii. p. 118. The Phenician merchants bought in exchange Attic pottery for their African trade.

¹ About the productiveness of the Spanish mines, Polybius (xxxiv. 9, 8) ap. Strabo, iii. p. 147; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 135.

Πότερ' ἦν τὸ τάριχος; Φρύγιον ἢ Γαδειρικόν;

The Phenician settlers on the coast of Spain became gradually more and more numerous, and appear to have been distributed, either in separate townships or intermingled with the native population, between the mouth of the Anas (Guadiana) and the town of Malaka (Malaga) on the Mediterranean. Unfortunately we are very little informed about their precise localities and details, but we find no information of Phenician settlements on the Mediterranean coast of Spain northward of Malaka; for Carthage or New Carthage was a Carthaginian settlement, founded only in the third century B.C.—after the first Punic war.¹ The Greek word Phenicians being used to signify as well the inhabitants of Carthage as those of Tyre and Sidon, it is not easy to distinguish what belongs to each of them. Nevertheless we can discern a great and important difference in the character of their establishments, especially in Iberia. The Carthaginians combined with their commercial projects large schemes of conquest and empire. It is thus that the independent Phenician establishments in and near the Gulf of Tunis in Africa were reduced to dependence upon them—while many new small townships, direct from Carthage itself, were planted on the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and the whole of that coast from the Greek Syrtis westward to the Pillars of Hêraklês (Strait of Gibraltar) is described as their territory in the Periplus of Skylax (B.C. 360). In Iberia, during the third century B.C., they maintained large armies,² constrained the inland tribes to subjection, and acquired a dominion which nothing but the superior force of Rome prevented from being durable; while in Sicily also the resistance of the Greeks prevented a similar consummation. But the foreign settlements of Tyre and Sidon were formed with views purely commercial. In the region of Tartêssus, as well as in the western coast of Africa outside of the Strait of Gibraltar, we hear only of pacific interchange and metallurgy; and the number of Phenicians who acquired gradually settlements in the interior was so great, that Strabo describes these towns (not less than 200 in number) as altogether phenicised.³ Since, in his time, the circumstances favourable to new Phenician immigrations had been long past and gone—there can be little hesitation in ascribing the preponderance, which this foreign element had then acquired, to a period several centuries earlier, beginning at a time when Tyre

Phenicians and Carthaginians—the establishments of the latter combined views of empire with views of commerce.

¹ Strabo, iii. pp. 156, 158, 161; Polybius, iii. 10, 3-10.

² Polyb. i. 10; ii. 1.

³ Strabo, iii. p. 141-150. Οἱτοὶ γὰρ

Φοίνικιν οὕτως ἐγένοντο ὑποχείριοι, ὥστε τὰς πλείους τῶν ἐν τῇ Τουρδιτανίᾳ πόλεων καὶ τῶν πλησίον τόπων ὑπ' ἐκείνων νῦν οἰκεῖσθαι.

and Sidon enjoyed both undisputed autonomy at home and the entire monopoly of Iberian commerce, without interference from the Greeks.

The earliest Grecian colony founded in Sicily was that of Naxos, planted by the Chalkidians in 735 B.C.: Syracuse followed in the next year, and during the succeeding century many flourishing Greek cities took root on the island. These Greeks found the Phenicians already in possession of many outlying islets and promontories all round the island, which served them in their trade with the Sikels and Sikans who occupied the interior. The safety and facilities of this established trade were to so great a degree broken up by the newcomers, that the Phenicians, relinquishing their numerous petty settlements round the island, concentrated themselves in three considerable towns at the south-western angle near Lilybæum¹—Motyê, Soloeis and Panormus—and in the island of Malta, where they were least widely separated from Utica and Carthage. The Tyrians of that day were hard-pressed by the Assyrians under Salmaneser, and the power of Carthage had not yet reached its height; otherwise probably this retreat of the Sicilian Phenicians before the Greeks would not have taken place without a struggle. But the early Phenicians, superior to the Greeks in mercantile activity, and not disposed to contend, except under circumstances of very superior force, with warlike adventurers bent on permanent settlement—took the prudent course of circumscribing their sphere of operations. A similar change appears to have taken place in Cyprus, the other island in which Greeks and Phenicians came into close contact. If we may trust the Tyrian annals consulted by the historian Menander, Cyprus was subject to the Tyrians even in the time of Solomon.² We do not know the dates of the establishment of Paphos, Salamis, Kitium, and the other Grecian cities there planted—but there can be no doubt that they were posterior to this period, and that a considerable portion of the soil and trade of Cyprus thus passed from Phenicians to Greeks; who on their part partially embraced and diffused the rites, sometimes cruel, sometimes voluptuous, embodied in the Phenician religion.³ In Kilikia, too, especially at Tarsus, the intrusion of Greek settlers appears to have gradually hellenised a town originally

¹ Thucyd. vi. 3; Diodor. v. 12.

² See the reference in Joseph. Antiq. Jud. viii. 5, 3, and Joseph. cont. Apion. i. 18; an allusion is to be found in Virgil, Æneid, i. 642, in the mouth of Dido:—

“Genitor tum Belus opimam
Vastabat Cyprum, et late ditione tenebat.” (t. v.)

³ Respecting the worship at Salamis (in Cyprus) and Paphos, see Lactant. i. 21; Strabo, xiv. p. 683.

Phenician and Assyrian; contributing, along with the other Grecian settlements (Phasêlis, Aspendus and Sidê) on the southern coast of Asia Minor, to narrow the Phenician range of adventure in that direction.¹

Such was the manner in which the Phenicians found themselves affected by the spread of Greek settlements. And if the Ionians of Asia Minor, when first conquered by Harpagus and the Persians, had followed the advice of the Prienean Bias to emigrate in a body and found one great Pan-Ionic colony in the island of Sardinia, these early merchants would have experienced the like hindrance² carried still farther westward—perhaps indeed the whole subsequent history of Carthage might have been sensibly modified. But Iberia, and the golden region of Tartêssus, remained comparatively little visited, and still less colonised, by the Greeks; nor did it even become known to them, until more than a century after their first settlements had been formed in Sicily. Easy as the voyage from Corinth to Cadiz may now appear to us, to a Greek of the seventh or sixth centuries B.C. it was a formidable undertaking. He was under the necessity of first coasting along Akarnania and Epirus, then crossing, first to the island of Korkyra, and next to the Gulf of Tarentum. Proceeding to double the southernmost cape of Italy, he followed the sinuosities of the Mediterranean coast, by Tyrhœnia, Liguria, Southern Gaul and Eastern Iberia, to the Pillars of Hêraklê or Strait of Gibraltar: or if he did not do this, he had the alternative of crossing the open sea from Krête or Peloponnesus to Libya, and then coasting westward along the perilous coast of the Syrtes until he arrived at the same point. Both voyages presented difficulties hard to be encountered; but the most serious hazard of all, was the direct transit across the open sea from Krête to Libya. It was about the year 630 B.C. that the inhabitants of the island of Thêra, starved out by a seven years' drought, were enjoined by the Delphian god to found a colony in Libya. Nothing short of the divine command would have induced them to obey so terrific a sentence of banishment; for not only was the region named quite unknown to them, but they could not discover, by the most careful inquiries among practised Greek navigators, a single man who had ever intentionally made the voy-

Iberia and
Tartêssus—
unvisited by
the Greeks
before about
630 B.C.

¹ Tarsus is mentioned by Dio Chrysostom as a colony from the Phenician Aradus (Orat. Tarsens. ii. p. 20, ed. Reisk.), and Herodotus makes Kilix brother of Phoenix and son of Agênôr (vii. 92).

Phœnician coins of the city of Tarsus are found, of a date towards the end of the Persian empire: see Movers, *Die Phônizier*, i. p. 13.

² Herodot. i. 170.

age to Libya.¹ One Kretan only could they find—a fisherman named Korôbius—who had been driven thither accidentally by violent gales, and he served them as guide.

At this juncture Egypt had only been recently opened to Greek commerce—Psammetichus having been the first king who partially relaxed the jealous exclusion of ships from the entrance of the Nile, enforced by all his predecessors. The incitement of so profitable a traffic emboldened some Ionian traders to make the direct voyage from Krête to the mouth of that river. It was in the prosecution of one of these voyages, and in connexion with the foundation of Kyrênê (to be recounted in a future chapter), that we are made acquainted with the memorable adventure of the Samian merchant Kôlæus. While bound for Egypt, he had been driven out of his course by contrary winds and had found shelter on an uninhabited islet called Platea, off the coast of Libya—the spot where the emigrants intended for Kyrênê first established themselves, not long afterwards. From hence he again started to proceed to Egypt, but again without success; violent and continuous east winds drove him continually to the westward, until he at length passed the Pillars of Hêraklês, and found himself, under the providential guidance of the gods,² an unexpected visitor among the Phenicians and Iberians of Tartêssus. What the cargo was which he was transporting to Egypt, we are not told. But it sold in this yet virgin market for the most exorbitant prices. He and his crew (says Herodotus³) “realised a profit larger than ever fell to the lot of any known Greek except Sostratus the Æginetan, with whom no one else can compete.” The magnitude of their profits may be gathered from the votive offering which they erected on their return in the sacred precinct of Hêrê at Samos, in gratitude for the protection of that goddess during their voyage. It was a large bronze vase, ornamented with projecting griffins’ heads and supported by three bronze kneeling figures of colossal stature: it cost six talents, and represented the tithe of their gains. The aggregate of sixty talents⁴ (about

¹ Herodot. iv. 151.

² Herodot. iv. 152. Θειῇ πομπῇ χρεώμενος.

³ Herodot. iv. 152. Τὸ δὲ ἐμπόριον τοῦτο (Tartêssus) ἦν ἀκήρατον τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ὥστε ἀπονοστήσαντες οὗτοι ὀπίσω μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων πάντων, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἀτρέκειω ἴδμεν, ἐκ φορτίων ἐκέρδησαν, μετὰ γε Σώστρατον τὸν Λαοδάμαντος, Αἰγινήτην· τούτῳ γὰρ οὐκ οἶα τε ἐρίσαι ἄλλον.

Allusions to the prodigious wealth of Tartêssus were found in Anakreon, *Fragm.* 8, ed. Bergk; Stephan. Byz. *Ταρτησσός*; Eustath. ad Dionys. *Perrîgêt.* 332, *Ταρτησσός*, ἣν καὶ ὁ Ἀνακρέων φησὶ πανευδαίμονα; Himerius ap. Photium, *Cod.* 243. p. 599—*Ταρτησσοῦ βίον*, Ἀμαλθείας κέρας, πᾶν ὅσον εὐδαιμονίας κεφαλαῖον.

⁴ These talents cannot have been Attic talents; for the Attic talent first

£16,000, speaking roughly), corresponding to this tithe, was a sum which not many even of the rich men of Athens in her richest time, could boast of possessing.

To the lucky accident of this enormous vase and the inscription doubtless attached to it, which Herodotus saw in the Hêræon at Samos, and to the impression which such miraculous enrichment made upon his imagination—we are indebted for our knowledge of the precise period at which the secret of Phenician commerce at Tartêssus first became known to the Greeks. The voyage of Kôlæus opened to the Greeks of that day a new world hardly less important (regard being had to their previous aggregate of knowledge) than the discovery of America to the Europeans of the last half of the fifteenth century. But Kôlæus did little more than make known the existence of this distant and lucrative region: he cannot be said to have shown the way to it. Nor do we find, in spite of the foundation of Kyrênê and Barka, which made the Greeks so much more familiar with the coast of Libya than they had been before—that the route, by which he had been carried against his own will, was ever deliberately pursued by Greek traders.

Probably the Carthaginians, altogether unscrupulous in proceedings against commercial rivals,¹ would have aggravated its natural maritime difficulties by false information and hostile proceedings. The simple report of such gains, however, was well-calculated to act as a stimulus to other enterprising navigators. The Phôkæans, during the course of the next half-century, pushing their exploring voyages both along the Adriatic and along the Tyrrhenian coast, and founding Massalia in the year 600 B.C., at length reached the Pillars of Hêraklêś and Tartêssus along the eastern coast of Spain. These men were the most adventurous mariners² that Greece had yet produced, creating a jealous uneasiness even among their Ionian neighbours.³

Exploring
voyages of
the Phô-
kæans,
between
630-570 B.C.

arose from the debasement of the Athenian money standard by Solon, which did not occur until a generation after the voyage of Kôlæus. They must have been either Euboic or Æginæan talents; probably the former, seeing that the case belongs to the island of Samos. Sixty Euboic talents would be about equivalent to the sum stated in the text. For the proportion of the various Greek monetary scales, see above, part 2. ch. iv. and ch. xii.

¹ Strabo, xvii. p. 802; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 84-132.

² Herodot. i. 163. Οἱ δὲ Φωκαῖες οὔτοι ναυτιλίῃσι μακρῇσι πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων ἐχρήσαντο, καὶ τὸν Ἀδρίην καὶ τὴν Τυρσηνὴν καὶ τὴν Ἰβηρίην καὶ τὸν Ταρτησσὸν οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ καταδείξαντες· ἐναυτίλλοντο δὲ οὐ στρογγύλῃσι νηυσὶν, ἀλλὰ πεντηκοντέρῃσιν—the expressions are remarkable.

³ Herodot. i. 164, 165 gives an example of the jealousy of the Chians in respect to the islands called Cænussæ.

Their voyages were made, not with round and bulky merchant-ships, calculated only for the maximum of cargo, but with armed pentekonteres—and they were thus enabled to defy the privateers of the Tyrrhenian cities on the Mediterranean, which had long deterred the Greek trader from any habitual traffic near the Strait of Messina.¹ There can be little doubt that the progress of the Phôkæans was very slow, and the foundation of Massalia (Marseilles), one of the most remote of all Greek colonies, may for a time have absorbed their attention: moreover they had to pick up information as they went on, and the voyage was one of discovery, in the strict sense of the word. The time at which they reached Tartêssus, may seemingly be placed between 570–560 B.C. They made themselves so acceptable to Arganthônios—king of Tartêssus, or at least king of part of that region—that he urged them to relinquish their city of Phôkæa and establish themselves in his territory, offering to them any site which they chose to occupy. Though they declined this tempting offer, yet he still continued anxious to aid them against dangers at home, and gave them a large donation of money—whereby they were enabled at a critical moment to complete their fortifications. Arganthônios died shortly afterwards, having lived (we are told) to the extraordinary age of 120 years, of which he had reigned 80. The Phôkæans had probably reason to repent of their refusal; since in no very long time their town having been taken by the Persians, half their citizens became exiles, and were obliged to seek a precarious abode in Corsica, in place of the advantageous settlement which old Arganthônios had offered to them in Tartêssus.²

By such steps did the Greeks gradually track out the lines of Phenician commerce in the Mediterranean, and accomplish that vast improvement in their geographical knowledge—the circumnavigation of what Eratosthenês and Strabo termed “our sea,” as distinguished from the external Ocean.³ Little practical advantage however was derived from the discovery, which was only made during the last years of Ionian independence. The Ionian cities became subjects of Persia, and Phôkæa especially was crippled and half-depopulated in the struggle. Had the period of Ionian enterprise been prolonged, we should probably have heard of other Greek settlements in Iberia and Tartêssus,—over and above Emporia and Rhodus, formed by the Massaliots between the Pyrenees and the

Important addition to Grecian geographical knowledge, and stimulus to Grecian fancy, thus communicated.

¹ Ephorus, Fragm. 52, ed. Marx; | ³ Ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλασσα (Strabo);
Strabo, vi. p. 267. | τῇσδε τῆς θαλάττης (Herod. iv. 41).

² Herodot. i. 165.

Ebro,—as well as of increasing Grecian traffic with those regions. The misfortunes of Phôkæa and the other Ionic towns saved the Phenicians of Tartêssus from Grecian interference and competition, such as that which their fellow-countrymen in Sicily had been experiencing for a century and a half.

But though the Ephesian Artemis, the divine protectress of Phôkæan emigration, was thus prevented from becoming consecrated in Tartêssus along with the Tyrian Hêrâklês, an impulse not the less powerful was given to the imaginations of philosophers like Thalês and poets like Stesichorus—whose lives cover the interval between the supernatural transport of Kôlæus on the wings of the wind, and the persevering, well-planned, exploration which emanated from Phôkæa. While, on the one hand, the Tyrian Hêrâklês with his venerated temple at Gadês furnished a new locality and details for mythes respecting the Grecian Hêrâklês—on the other hand, intelligent Greeks learnt for the first time that the waters surrounding their islands and the Peloponnesus formed part of a sea circumscribed by assignable boundaries. Continuous navigation of the Phôkæans round the coasts, first of the Adriatic, next of the Gulf of Lyons to the Pillars of Hêrâklês and Tartêssus, first brought to light this important fact. The hearers of Archilochus, Simonidês of Amorgus, and Kallinus, living before or contemporary with the voyage of Kôlæus, had no known sea-limit either north of Korkyra or west of Sicily: but those of Anakreon and Hippônax, a century afterwards, found the Euxine, the Palus Mæotis, the Adriatic, the Western Mediterranean, and the Libyan Syrtes, all so far surveyed as to present to the mind a definite conception, and to admit of being visibly represented by Anaximander on a map. However familiar such knowledge has now become to us, at the time now under discussion it was a prodigious advance. The Pillars of Hêrâklês, especially, remained deeply fixed in the Greek mind, as a terminus of human adventure and aspiration: of the Ocean beyond, men were for the most part content to remain ignorant.

It has already been stated, that the Phenicians, as coast explorers, were even more enterprising than the Phôkæans. But their jealous commercial spirit induced them to conceal their track,—to give information designedly false¹ respecting dangers and difficulties,—and even to drown any com-

Circumnavigation of Africa by the Phenicians.

¹ The geographer Ptolemy, with genuine scientific zeal, complains bitterly of the reserve and frauds common with the old traders, respecting the countries which they visited (Ptolem. Geogr. i. 11).

mercials rivals when they could do so with safety.¹ One remarkable Phenician achievement, however, contemporary with the period of Phôkæan exploration, must not be passed over. It was somewhere about 600 B.C. that they circumnavigated Africa; starting from the Red Sea, by direction of the Egyptian king Nekôs, son of Psammetichus—going round the Cape of Good Hope to Gadês—and from thence returning to the Nile.

It appears that Nekôs, anxious to procure a water-communication between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, began digging a canal from the former to the Nile, but desisted from the undertaking after having made considerable progress. In prosecution of the same object, he despatched these Phenicians on an experimental voyage from the Red Sea round Libya, which was successfully accomplished, though in a time not less than three years; for during each autumn, the mariners landed and remained on shore a sufficient time to sow their seed and raise a crop of corn. They reached Egypt again through the Strait of Gibraltar, in the course of the third year, and recounted a tale—"which (says Herodotus) others may perhaps believe, but I cannot believe"—that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand, *i. e.* to the north.²

The reality of this circumnavigation was confirmed to Herodotus by various Carthaginian informants,³ and he himself fully believes it. There seems good reason for sharing in his belief, though several able critics reject the tale as incredible. The Phenicians were expert and daring masters of coast navigation, and in going round Africa they had no occasion ever to lose sight of land. We may presume that their vessels were amply stored, so that they could take their own time, and lie by in bad weather; we may also take for

This circumnavigation was really accomplished—doubts of critics, ancient and modern, examined.

¹ Strabo, iii. p. 175, 176; xvii. p. 802.

² Herodot. iv. 42. Καὶ ἔλεγον, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ, ἄλλω δὲ δὴ τέφ, ὡς περιπλάουσιν τὴν Λιβύην, τὸν ἥλιον ἔσχον ἐς τὰ δεξιὰ.

³ Herodot. Οὕτω μὲν αὐτὴ ἐγνώσθη τοπρώτων (*i. e.* ἡ Λιβύη ἐγνώσθη ἐοῦσα περίρρυτος) μετὰ δὲ, Καρχηδόνιοι εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες. These Carthaginians, to whom Herodotus here alludes, told him that Libya was circumnavigable: but it does not seem that they knew of any other actual circumnavigation except that of the Phenicians sent by Nekôs; otherwise Herodotus would have made some allusion to it, instead of proceed-

ing, as he does immediately, to tell the story of the Persian Sataspês, who tried and failed.

The testimony of the Carthaginians is so far valuable, as it declares their persuasion of the truth of the statement made by those Phenicians.

Some critics have construed the words, in which Herodotus alludes to the Carthaginians as his informants, as if what they told him was the story of the fruitless attempt made by Sataspês. But this is evidently not the meaning of the historian: he brings forward the opinion of the Carthaginians as confirmatory of the statement made by the Phenicians employed by Nekôs.

granted that the reward consequent upon success was considerable. For any other mariners then existing, indeed, the undertaking might have been too hard, but it was not so for them, and that was the reason why Nekôs chose them. To such reasons, which show the story to present no intrinsic incredibility (that indeed is hardly alleged even by Mannert and others who disbelieve it), we may add one other, which goes far to prove it positively true. They stated that in the course of their circuit, while going westward, they had the sun on their right hand (*i. e.* to the northward); and this phænomenon, observable according to the season even when they were within the tropics, could not fail to force itself on their attention as constant, after they had reached the southern temperate zone. But Herodotus at once pronounces this part of the story to be incredible, and so it might appear to almost every man, Greek,¹ Phenician or Egyptian, not only of the age of Nekôs, but even of the time of Herodotus, who heard it; since none of them possessed either actual experience of the phænomena of a southern latitude, or a sufficiently correct theory of the relation between sun and earth, to understand the varying direction of the shadows; and few men would consent to set aside the received ideas with reference to the solar motions, from pure confidence in the veracity of these Phenician narrators. Now that under such circumstances the latter should invent the tale is highly improbable; and if they were not inventors, they must have experienced the phænomenon during the southern portion of their transit.

Some critics disbelieve this circumnavigation, from supposing that if so remarkable an achievement had really taken place once, it must have been repeated, and practical application must have been made of it. But though such a suspicion is not unnatural, with those who recollect how great a revolution was operated when the passage was rediscovered during the fifteenth century—yet the reasoning will not be found applicable to the sixth century before the Christian æra.

Pure scientific curiosity, in that age, counted for nothing. The motive of Nekôs for directing this enterprise was the same as that which had prompted him to dig his canal,—in order that he might procure the best communication between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. But, as it has been, with the north-west passage in our time, so it was with the circumnavigation of Africa in his—the

¹ Diodorus (iii. 40) talks correct language about the direction of the shadows southward of the tropic of Cancer (compare Pliny, H. N. vi. 29)—one mark of

the extension of geographical and astronomical observations during the four intervening centuries between him and Herodotus.

proof of its practicability at the same time showed that it was not available for purposes of traffic or communication, looking to the resources then at the command of navigators—a fact, however, which could not be known until the experiment was made. To pass from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea by means of the Nile still continued to be the easiest way; either by aid of the land journey, which in the times of the Ptolemies was usually made from Koptos on the Nile to Berenikê on the Red Sea—or by means of the canal of Nekôs, which Darius afterwards finished, though it seems to have been neglected during the Persian rule in Egypt, and was subsequently repaired and put to service under the Ptolemies. Without any doubt the successful Phenician mariners underwent both severe hardship and great real perils, besides those still greater supposed perils, the apprehension of which so constantly unnerved the minds even of experienced and resolute men in the unknown Ocean. Such was the force of these terrors and difficulties, to which there was no known termination, upon the mind of the Achæmenid Sataspês (upon whom the circumnavigation of Africa was imposed as a penalty “worse than death” by Xerxês, in commutation of a capital sentence), that he returned without having finished the circuit, though by so doing he forfeited his life. He affirmed that he had sailed “until his vessel stuck fast, and could move on no farther”—a persuasion not uncommon in ancient times and even down to Columbus, that there was a point, beyond which the Ocean, either from mud, sands, shallows, fogs, or accumulations of sea-weed, was no longer navigable.¹

¹ Skylax, after following the line of coast from the Mediterranean outside of the Strait of Gibraltar, and then south-westward along Africa as far as the island of Kernê, goes on to say, that “beyond Kernê the sea is no longer navigable from shallows and mud and sea-weed”—*Τῆς δὲ Κέρνης γῆσου τὰ ἐπέκεινα οὐκετὶ ἐστὶ πλωτὰ διὰ βραχύτητα θαλάττης καὶ πηλὸν καὶ φύκος. Ἔσθι δὲ τὸ φύκος τῆς δοχμῆς τὸ πλάτος καὶ ἄνωθεν ὀξὺ, ὥστε κεντεῖν* (Skylax, c. 109). Nearchus, on undertaking his voyage down the Indus and from thence into the Persian Gulf, is not certain whether the external sea will be found navigable—*εἰ δὴ πλωτός γέ ἐστιν ὁ ταύτη πόντος* (Nearchi Periplus, p. 2: compare p. 40 ap. Geogr. Minor. vol. i. ed. Hudson). Pytheas described the neighbourhood of Thulê as a sort of chaos—a medley of earth, sea and air in which you could neither walk nor sail—*οὔτε γῇ καθ’ αὐτὴν*

ὑπῆρχεν οὔτε θάλασσα οὔτε ἀήρ, ἀλλὰ σύγκριμά τι ἐκ τούτων πλεύμονι θαλασσίῳ ἑοικὸς, ἐν ᾧ φησὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν αἰωρεῖσθαι καὶ τὰ σύμπαντα, καὶ τοῦτον ὡς ἂν δεσμὸν εἶναι τῶν ὄλων, μήτε πορευτὸν μήτε πλωτὸν ὑπάρχοντα· τὸ μὲν οὖν τῷ πλεύμονι ἑοικὸς αὐτὸς (Pytheas) ἔωρακέναι, τὰλλα δὲ λέγειν ἐξ ἀκοῆς (Strabo, ii. p. 104). Again, the priests of Memphis told Herodotus that their conquering hero Sesostris had equipped a fleet in the Arabian Gulf, and made a voyage into the Erythræan Sea, subjugating people everywhere, “until he came to a sea no longer navigable from shallows”—*οὐκετι πλωτὴν ὑπὸ βραχέων* (Herod. ii. 109). Plato represents the sea without the Pillars of Héraklês as impenetrable and unfit for navigation, in consequence of the large admixture of earth, mud, or vegetable covering, which had arisen in it from the disruption of the great island or continent Atlantis (Timæus, p. 25; and

Now we learn from hence that the enterprise, even by those who believed the narrative of Nekôs's captains, was regarded as at

Kritias, p. 108); which passages are well-illustrated by the Scholiast, who seems to have read geographical descriptions of the character of this outer sea—*τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τοὺς ἐκείνη τόπους ἱστοροῦντες λέγουσιν, ὡς πάντα τεναγρῶδη τὸν ἐκεῖ εἶναι χάρον τέναγος δὲ ἔσθιν ἰλύς τις, ἐπιπολάζοντος ὕδατος οὐ πολλοῦ, καὶ βοτάνης ἐπιφαινομένης τούτῳ*. See also Plutarch's fancy of the dense, earthy, and viscous Kronian sea (some days to the westward of Britain), in which a ship could with difficulty advance, and only by means of severe pulling with the oars (Plutarch, *De Facie in Orbe Lunæ*, c. 26. p. 941). So again in the two geographical productions in verse by Rufus Festus Avienus (*Hudson, Geogr. Minor. vol. iv., Descriptio Orbis Terræ*, v. 57, and *Ora Maritima*, v. 406–415): in the first of these two, the density of the water of the Western Ocean is ascribed to its being saturated with salt—in the second, we have shallows, large quantities of sea-weed, and wild beasts swimming about, which the Carthaginian Himilco affirmed himself to have seen :

"Plerumque porro tenue tenditur salum,
Ut vix arenas subjacentes occulat;
Exsuperat autem gurgitem fucus frequens
Atque impeditur æstus ex uligine:
Vis vel ferarum pelagus omne internatat,
Mutusque terror ex feris habitat freta.
Hæc olim Himilco Pœnus Oceano super
Spectasse semet et probasse rettulit:
Hæc nos, ab imis Punicorum annalibus
Prolata longo tempore, edidimus tibi."

Compare also v. 115–130 of the same poem, where the author again quotes from a voyage of Himilco, who had been four months in the ocean outside of the Pillars of Hercules :—

"Sic nulla late fiabra propellunt ratem,
Sic segnis humor æquoris pigri stupet,
Adjicit et illud, plurimum inter gurgites
Extare fucum, et sæpe virgulti vice
Retinere puppin," &c.

The dead calm, mud, and shallows of the external ocean are touched upon by Aristot. *Meteorolog. ii. 1, 14*, and seem to have been a favourite subject of declamation with the rhetors of the Augustan age. See Seneca, *Suasoriar. i. 1*.

Even the companions and contemporaries of Columbus, when navigation

had made such comparative progress, still retained much of these fears respecting the dangers and difficulties of the unknown ocean :—“Le tableau exagéré (observe A. von Humboldt, *Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie*, t. iii. p. 95) que la ruse des Phéniciens avait tracé des difficultés qu'opposaient à la navigation au delà des Colonnes d'Hercule, de Cerné, et de l'Île Sacrée (Ierné), le fucus, le limon, le manque de fond, et le calme perpétuel de la mer, ressemble d'une manière frappante aux récits animés des premiers compagnons de Colomb.”

Columbus was the first man who traversed the sea of Sargasso, or area of the Atlantic Ocean south of the Azores, where it is covered by an immense mass of sea-weed for a space six or seven times as large as France: the alarm of his crew at this unexpected spectacle was considerable. The seaweed is sometimes so thickly accumulated, that it requires a considerable wind to impel the vessel through it. The remarks and comparisons of M. von Humboldt in reference to ancient and modern navigation are highly interesting (*Examen. ut sup.* pp. 69, 88, 91, &c.).

J. M. Gesner (*Dissertat. de Navigationibus extra Columnas Herculis*, sect. 6 and 7) has a good defence of the story told by Herodotus. Major Rennell also adopts the same view, and shows by many arguments how much easier the circumnavigation was from the East than from the West (*Geograph. System of Herodotus*, p. 680): compare Ukert, *Geograph. der Griechen und Römer*, vol. i. p. 61; Mannert, *Geog. d. G. und Römer*, vol. i. p. 19–26. Gosselin (*Recherches sur la Géogr. des Anc. i. p. 149*) and Mannert both reject the story as not worthy of belief: Heeren defends it (*Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt*, i. 2. p. 86–95).

Agatharchides, in the second century, B.C., pronounces the eastern coast of Africa, southward of the Red Sea, to be as yet unexamined: he treats it as a matter of certainty however that the sea to the south-westward is continuous with the Western Ocean (*De Rubro Mari*, *Geogr. Minores*, ed. Huds. v. i. p. 11).

once desperate and unprofitable; but doubtless many persons treated it as a mere "Phenician lie"¹ (to use an expression proverbial in ancient times). The circumnavigation of Libya is said to have been one of the projects conceived by Alexander the Great.² We may readily believe that if he had lived longer, it would have been confided to Nearchus or some other officer of the like competence, and in all probability would have succeeded, especially since it would have been undertaken from the eastward—to the great profit of geographical knowledge among the ancients, but with little advantage to their commerce. There is then adequate reason for admitting that these Phenicians rounded the Cape of Good Hope from the East about 600 B.C., more than 2000 years earlier than Vasco de Gama did the same thing from the West; though the discovery was in the first instance of no avail, either for commerce or for geographical science.

Besides the maritime range of Tyre and Sidon, their trade by

¹ Strabo, iii. p. 170. Sataspês (the unsuccessful Persian circumnavigator of Libya, mentioned just above) had violated the daughter of another Persian nobleman, Zopyrus son of Megabyzus, and Xerxês had given orders that he should be crucified for this act: his mother begged him off by suggesting that he should be condemned to something "*worse than death*"—the circumnavigation of Libya (Herod. iv. 43). Two things are to be remarked in respect to his voyage:—1. He took with him a ship and seamen from Egypt; we are not told that they were Phenician; probably no other mariners than Phenicians were competent to such a voyage—and even if the crew of Sataspês had been Phenicians, he could not offer rewards for success equal to those at the disposal of Nekôs. 2. He began his enterprise from the Strait of Gibraltar instead of from the Red Sea: now it seems that the current between Madagascar and the eastern coast of Africa sets very strongly towards the Cape of Good Hope, so that while it greatly assists the southerly voyage, on the other hand, it makes return by the same way very difficult. (See Humboldt, *Examen Critique de l'Histoire de la Géographie*, t. i. p. 3433.) Strabo however affirms that all those who had tried to circumnavigate Africa, both from the Red Sea and from the Strait of Gibraltar, had been forced to return without success (i. p. 32), so that most people believed that there was a con-

tinuous isthmus which rendered it impracticable to go by sea from the one point to the other: he is himself however persuaded that the Atlantic is *σύρρουν* on both sides of Africa, and therefore that circumnavigation is possible. He as well as Poseidonius (ii. p. 98–100) disbelieved the tale of the Phenicians sent by Nekôs. He must have derived his complete conviction, that Libya might be circumnavigated, from geographical theory, which led him to contract the dimensions of that continent southward—inasmuch as the thing in his belief never had been done, though often attempted. Mannert (*Geog. d. G. und Röm.* i. p. 24) erroneously says that Strabo and others founded their belief on the narrative of Herodotus.

It is worth while remarking that Strabo cannot have read the story in Herodotus with much attention, since he mentions Darius as the king who sent the Phenicians round Africa, not Nekôs; nor does he take notice of the remarkable statement of these navigators respecting the position of the sun. There were doubtless many apocryphal narratives current in his time respecting attempts, successful and unsuccessful, to circumnavigate Africa, as we may see by the tale of Eudoxus (Strabo, ii. 98; Cornel. Nep. ap. Plin. H. N. ii. 67, who gives the story very differently; and Pomp. Mela, iii. 9).

² Arrian, *Exp. Al.* vii. 1, 2.

land in the interior of Asia was of great value and importance. They were the speculative merchants who directed the march of the caravans laden with Assyrian and Egyptian products across the deserts which separated them from inner Asia¹—an operation which presented hardly less difficulties, considering the Arabian depredators whom they were obliged to conciliate and even to employ as carriers, than the longest coast voyage. They seem to have stood alone in antiquity in their willingness to brave, and their ability to surmount, the perils of a distant land-traffic;² and their descendants at Carthage and Utica were not less active in pushing caravans far into the interior of Africa.

¹ Herodot. i. 1. Φοινίκας—ἀπαγινέον-
τας φόρτια Ἀσσύριδ τε καὶ Αἰγύπτια.

² See the valuable chapter in Heeren
(Ueber den Verkehr der Alten Welt, i.
2. Abschn. 4. p. 96) about the land

trade of the Phenicians.

The twenty-seventh chapter of the
Prophet Ezekiel presents a striking
picture of the general commerce of
Tyre.

DOMINICA COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XIX.

ASSYRIANS—BABYLON,

THE name of the Assyrians who formed one wing of this early system of intercourse and commerce, rests chiefly upon the great cities of Nineveh and Babylon. To the Assyrians of Nineveh (as has been already mentioned) is ascribed in early times a very extensive empire, covering much of Upper Asia, as well as Mesopotamia or the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Respecting this empire—its commencement, its extent, or even the mode in which it was put down—nothing certain can be affirmed. But it seems unquestionable that many great and flourishing cities—and a population inferior in enterprise, but not in industry, to the Phenicians—were to be found on the Euphrates and Tigris, in times anterior to the first Olympiad. Of these cities, Nineveh on the Tigris and Babylon on the Euphrates were the chief:¹ the latter being in some sort of dependence, probably, on the sovereigns of Nineveh, yet governed by kings or chiefs of its own, and comprehending an hereditary order of priests named Chaldæans, masters of all the science and literature as well as of the religious ceremonies current among the people, and devoted from very early times to that habit of astronomical observation which their brilliant sky so much favoured.

The people called Assyrians or Syrians (for among the Greek authors no constant distinction is maintained between the two²)

¹ Herodot. i. 178. Τῆς δὲ Ἀσσυρίης ἐστὶ μὲν κού καὶ ἄλλα πόλεις μεγάλα πολλά· τὸ δὲ ὀνομαστότατον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον, καὶ ἔνθα σφι, τῆς Νίνου ἀναστάτου γενομένης, τὰ βασιλῆα κατεστήκεε, ἦν Βαβυλών.

The existence of these and several other great cities is an important item to be taken in, in our conception of the old Assyria: Opis on the Tigris, and Sittakê very near the Tigris, were among them (Xenoph. Anab. ii. 4, 13-25): compare Diodor. ii. 11.

² Herodot. i. 72; iii. 90-91; vii. 63:

Strabo, xvi. p. 736, also ii. p. 84, in which he takes exception to the distribution of the οἰκουμένη (inhabited portion of the globe) made by Eratosthenês, because it did not include in the same compartment (σφραγίς) Syria proper and Mesopotamia; he calls Ninus and Semiramis, Syrians. Herodotus considers the Armenians as colonists from the Phrygians (vii. 73).

The Homeric names Ἀρίμοι, Ἐρεμβοί (the first in the Iliad, ii. 783, the second in the Odyssey, iv. 84) coincide with the Oriental name of this race *Aram*: it

were distributed over the wide territory bounded on the east by Mount Zagros and its north-westerly continuation towards Mount Ararat, by which they were separated from the Medes—and extending from thence westward and southward to the Euxine Sea, the river Halys, the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf—thus covering the whole course of the Tigris and Euphrates south of Armenia, as well as Syria and Syria-Palæstine, and the territory eastward of the Halys called Kappadokia. But the Chaldæan order of priests appears to have been peculiar to Babylon and other towns in its territory, especially between that city and the Persian Gulf. The vast, rich, and lofty temple of Bélus in that city served them at once as a place of worship and an astronomical observatory. It was the paramount ascendancy of this order which seems to have caused the Babylonian people generally to be spoken of as Chaldæans—though some writers have supposed, without any good proof, a conquest of Assyrian Babylon by barbarians called Chaldæans from the mountains near the Euxine.¹

Chaldæans
at Babylon
—order of
priests.

There were exaggerated statements respecting the antiquity of their astronomical observations, which cannot be traced as of definite and recorded date higher than the æra of Nabonassar² (747 B.C.), as well as respecting the extent of their

Their astro-
nomical ob-
servations.

seems more ancient in the Greek habits of speech, than *Syrians* (see Strabo, xvi. p. 785).

The Hesiodic Catalogue too, as well as Stésichorus, recognised *Arabus* as the son of Hermès by Throniê daughter of Bélus (Hesiod, Fragm. 29, ed. Marktscheffel; Strabo, i. p. 42).

¹ Heeren, in his account of the Babylonians (Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt, part i. Abtheilung 2. p. 168), speaks of this conquest of Babylon by Chaldæan barbarians from the northern mountains as a certain fact, explaining the great development of the Babylonian empire under Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar from 630–580 B.C.; it was (he thinks) the new Chaldæan conquerors who thus extended their dominion over Judæa and Phenicia.

I agree with Volney (Chronologie des Babyloniens, ch. x. p. 215) in thinking this statement both unsupported and improbable. Mannert seems to suppose the Chaldæans of Arabian origin (Geogr. der Gr. und Röm., part v. s. 2. ch. xii. p. 419). The passages of Strabo (xvi. p. 739) are more favourable to this opinion than to that of Heeren; but we

make out nothing distinct respecting the Chaldæans except that they were the priestly order among the Assyrians of Babylon, as they are expressly termed by Herodotus—ὡς λέγονσι οἱ Χαλδαῖοι, εἶντες ἱερεῖς τοῦτου τοῦ θεοῦ (of Zeus Bélus) (Herodot. i. 181).

² The earliest Chaldæan astronomical observation, known to the astronomer Ptolemy, both precise and of ascertained date to a degree sufficient for scientific use, was a lunar eclipse of the 19th March 721 B.C.—the 27th year of the æra of Nabonassar (Ideler, Ueber die Astronomischen Beobachtungen der Alten, p. 19, Berlin, 1806). Had Ptolemy known any older observations conforming to these conditions, he would not have omitted to notice them: his own words in the Almagest testify how much he valued the knowledge and comparison of observations taken at distant intervals (Almagest, b. 3. p. 62, ap. Ideler, *l. c.* p. 1), and at the same time imply that he had none more ancient than the æra of Nabonassar (Alm. iii. p. 77, ap. Ideler, p. 169).

That the Chaldæans had been, long before this period, in the habit of ob-

acquired knowledge, so largely blended with astrological fancies and occult influences of the heavenly bodies on human affairs. But however incomplete their knowledge may appear when judged by the standard of after-times, there can be no doubt, that com-

serving the heavens, there is no reason to doubt; and the exactness of those observations cited by Ptolemy implies (according to the judgement of Ideler, *ib.* p. 167) long previous practice. The period of 223 lunations, after which the moon reverts nearly to the same positions in reference to the apsides and nodes, and after which eclipses return nearly in the same order and magnitude, appears to have been discovered by the Chaldæans ("Defectus ducentis viginti tribus mensibus redire in suos orbes certum est," Pliny, H. N. ii. 13), and they deduced from hence the mean daily motions of the moon with a degree of accuracy which differs only by four seconds from modern lunar tables (Geminus, *Isagoge in Arati Phænomena*, c. 15; Ideler, *l. c.* pp. 153, 154, and in his *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. i. Absch. ii. p. 207).

There seem to have been Chaldæan observations, both made and recorded, of much greater antiquity than the æra of Nabonassar; though we cannot lay much stress on the date of 1903 years anterior to Alexander the Great, which is mentioned by Simplicius (*ad Aristot. de Cælo*, p. 123) as being the earliest period of the Chaldæan observations sent from Babylon by Kallisthenès to Aristotle. Ideler thinks that the Chaldæan observations anterior to the æra of Nabonassar were useless to astronomers from the want of some fixed æra, or definite cycle, to identify the date of each of them. The common civil year of the Chaldæans had been from the beginning (like that of the Greeks) a lunar year, kept in a certain degree of harmony with the sun by cycles of lunar years and intercalation. Down to the æra of Nabonassar, the calendar was in confusion, and there was nothing to verify either the time of accession of the kings or that of astronomical phenomena observed, except the days and months of this lunar year. In the reign of Nabonassar the astronomers at Babylon introduce (not into civil use, but for their own purposes and records) the Egyptian solar year—of 365 days, or 12 months of thirty days each, with five added days, beginning with the first of the month

Toth, the commencement of the Egyptian year—and they thus first obtained a continuous and accurate mode of marking the date of events. It is not meant that the Chaldæans then for the first time obtained from the Egyptians the *knowledge* of the solar year of 365 days, but that they then for the first time adopted it in their notation of time for astronomical purposes, fixing the precise moment at which they began. Nor is there the least reason to suppose that the æra of Nabonassar coincided with any political revolution or change of dynasty. Ideler discusses this point (pp. 146–173, and *Handbuch der Chronol.* pp. 215–220). Syncellus might correctly say—Ἀπὸ Νοβονασσάρου τοὺς χρόνους τῆς τῶν Ἰστωρῶν παρατηρησέως Χαλδαῖοι ἠκρίβωσαν (*Chronogr.* p. 207).

We need not dwell upon the back reckonings of the Chaldæans for periods of 720,000, 490,000, 470,000 years, mentioned by Cicero, Diodorus and Pliny (Cicero, *De Divin.* ii. 46; Diod. ii. 31; Pliny, H. N. vii. 57), and seemingly presented by Berosus and others as the preface of Babylonian history.

It is to be noted that Ptolemy always cited the Chaldæan observations as made by "*the Chaldæans*," never naming any individual; though in all the other observations to which he alludes, he is very scrupulous in particularising the name of the observer. Doubtless he found the Chaldæan observations registered just in this manner; a point which illustrates what is said in the text respecting the collective character of their civilization, and the want of individual development or prominent genius.

The superiority of the Chaldæan priests to the Egyptian as astronomical observers is shown by the fact, that Ptolemy, though living at Alexandria, never mentions the latter as astronomers, nor cites any Egyptian observations; while he cites thirteen Chaldæan observations in the years B.C. 721, 720, 523, 502, 491, 383, 382, 245, 237, 229: the first ten being observations of lunar eclipses; the last three, of conjunctions of planets and fixed stars (Ideler, *Handbuch der Chronologie*, vol. i. Ab. ii. p. 195–199).

pared with any of their contemporaries of the sixth century B.C. (either Egyptians, Greeks or Asiatics) they stood pre-eminent, and had much to teach, not only to Thalês and Pythagoras, but even to later inquirers, such as Eudoxus and Aristotle. The conception of the revolving celestial sphere, the gnomon, and the division of the day into twelve parts, are affirmed by Herodotus¹ to have been first taught to the Greeks by the Babylonians; and the continuous observation of the heavens both by the Egyptian and Chaldæan priests, had determined with considerable exactness both the duration of the solar year and other longer periods of astronomical recurrence; thus impressing upon intelligent Greeks the imperfection of their own calendars, and furnishing them with a basis not only for enlarged observations of their own, but also for the discovery and application of those mathematical theories whereby astronomy first became a science.

It was not only the astronomical acquisitions of the priestly caste which distinguished the early Babylonians. The social condition, the fertility of the country, the dense population, and the persevering industry of the inhabitants, were not less remarkable. Respecting Nineveh,² once the greatest of the Assyrian cities, we have no good information, nor can we safely reason from the analogy of Babylon, inasmuch as the peculiarities of the latter were altogether determined by the Euphrates, while Nineveh was seated considerably farther north, and on the east bank of the Tigris. But Herodotus gives us valuable particulars respecting Babylon as an eye-witness. We may judge by his account, representing its condition after much suffering from the Persian conquest, what it had been a century earlier in the days of its full splendour.

The neighbouring territory, receiving but little rain,³ owed its

¹ Herodot. ii. 109.

² The ancient Ninus or Nineveh was situated on the eastern bank of the Tigris, nearly opposite the modern town of Mousul or Mosul. Herodotus (i. 193) and Strabo (xvi. p. 737) both speak of it as being destroyed; but Tacitus (Ann. xii. 13) and Ammian. Marcell. (xviii. 7) mention it as subsisting. Its ruins had been long remarked (see Thevenot, Voyages, liv. i. ch. xi. p. 176, and Niebuhr, Reisen, vol. ii. p. 360), but have never been examined carefully until recently by Rich, Layard, and others: see Ritter, West-Asien, b. iii. Abtheil. iii. Abschn. i. s. 45. p. 171-221; and Forbiger,

Handbuch der Alten Geographie, s. 96. p. 612; and above all the interesting work of Mr. Layard, who has procured from the spot so many valuable remains of antiquity.

Ktésias, according to Diodorus (ii. 3), placed Ninus or Nineveh on the Euphrates, which we must presume to be an inadvertence—probably of Diodorus himself, for Ktésias would be less likely than he to confound the Euphrates and the Tigris. Compare Westseling ad Diodor. ii. 3, and Bähr ad Ktesie Fragm. ii. Assyr. p. 392.

³ Herodot. i. 193. 'Ἡ γῆ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ὕεται μὲν ὀλίγω—while he speaks of rain falling at Thebes in Egypt as a

fertility altogether to the annual overflowing of the Euphrates, on which the labour bestowed, for the purpose of limiting, regularising, and diffusing its supply of water, was stupendous. Embankments along the river—artificial reservoirs in connexion with it to receive an excessive increase—new curvilinear channels dug for the water in places where the stream was too straight and rapid—broad and deep canals crossing the whole space between the Euphrates and the Tigris, and feeding numerous rivulets¹ or ditches which enabled the whole breadth of land to be irrigated—all these toilsome applications were requisite to ensure due moisture for the Babylonian soil. But they were rewarded with an exuberance of produce, in the various descriptions of grain, such as Herodotus hardly dares to particularise. The country produced no trees except the date-palm; which was turned to account in many different ways, and from the fruit of which, both copious and of extraordinary size, wine as well as bread was made.² Moreover, Babylonia was still more barren of stone than of wood, so that buildings as well as walls were constructed almost entirely of brick, for which the earth was well-adapted; while a flow of mineral bitumen, found near the town and river of Is, higher up the Euphrates, served for cement. Such persevering and systematic labour, applied for the purpose of irrigation, excites our astonishment; yet the description of what was done for defence is still more imposing. Babylon, traversed in the middle by the Euphrates, was surrounded by walls three hundred feet in height, seventy-five feet in thickness, and composing a square of which each side was one hundred and twenty stadia (or nearly fifteen English miles) in length. Around

City of Babylon—its dimensions and walls.

prodigy, which never happened except just at the moment when the country was conquered by Cambyses—*οὐ γὰρ δὴ βεταί τὰ ἄνω τῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸ παράπαν* (iii. 10). It is not unimportant to notice this distinction between the little rain of Babylonia, and the no rain of Upper Egypt—as a mark of measured assertion in the historian from whom so much of our knowledge of Grecian history is derived.

It chanced to rain hard during the four days which the traveller Niebuhr spent in going from the ruins of Babylon to Bagdad, at the end of November 1763 (Reisen, vol. ii. p. 292).

¹ Herodot. i. 193; Xenophon, Anab. i. 7, 15; ii. 4, 13–22.

² About the date-palms (*φοίνικες*) in the ancient Babylonia, see Theophras-

tus, Hist. Plant. ii. 6, 2–6; Xenoph. Cyrop. vii. 5, 12; Anab. ii. 3, 15; Diodor. ii. 53; there were some which bore no fruit, but which afforded good wood for house-purposes and furniture.

Theophrastus gives the same general idea of the fertility and produce of the soil in Babylonia as Herodotus, though the two-hundred-fold, and sometimes three-hundred-fold, which was stated to the latter as the produce of the land in grain, appears in his statement cut down to fifty-fold or one-hundred-fold (Hist. Plant. viii. 7, 4).

Respecting the numerous useful purposes for which the date-palm was made to serve (a Persian song enumerated three hundred and sixty, see Strabo, xvi. p. 742; Ammian. Marcell. xxiv. 3.

the outside of the walls was a broad and deep moat from whence the material for the bricks composing them had been excavated; while one hundred brazen gates served for ingress and egress. Besides, there was an interior wall less thick, but still very strong; and as a still farther obstruction to invaders from the north and north-east, another high and thick wall was built at some miles from the city, across the space between the Euphrates and the Tigris—called the wall of Media, seemingly a little to the north of that point where the two rivers most nearly approach to each other, and joining the Tigris on its west bank. Of the houses many were three or four stories high, and the broad and straight streets, unknown in a Greek town until the distribution of the Peiræus by Hippodamus near the time of the Peloponnesian war, were well-calculated to heighten the astonishment raised by the whole spectacle in a visitor like Herodotus. The royal palace, with its memorable terraces or hanging gardens, formed the central and commanding edifice in one half of the city—the temple of Bêlus in the other half.

That celebrated temple, standing upon a basis of one square stadium, and enclosed in a precinct of two square stadia in dimension, was composed of eight solid towers, built one above the other, and is alleged by Strabo to have been as much as a stadium or furlong high (the height is not specified by Herodotus¹). It was full of costly decorations, and possessed an extensive landed property. Along the banks of the river, in its passage through the city, were built spacious quays, and a bridge on stone piles—for the placing of which (as Herodotus was told) Semiramis had caused the river Euphrates to be drained off into the large side reservoir and lake constructed higher up its course.²

¹ Herodot. i. 178; Strabo, xvi. p. 738; Arrian, E. A. vii. 17, 7. Strabo does not say that it was a stadium in *perpendicular* height: we may suppose that the stadium represents the entire distance in upward march from the bottom to the top. He as well as Arrian say that Xerxês destroyed both the temple of Bêlus and all the other temples at Babylon (*καθεῖλεν, κατέσκαψεν*, iii. 16, 6; vii. 17, 4); he talks of the intention of Alexander to rebuild it, and of his directions given to level the foundation anew, carrying away the loose earth and ruins. This cannot be reconciled with the narrative of Herodotus, nor with the statement of Pliny (vi. 30), nor do I believe it to be true. Xerxês plundered the temple of much

of its wealth and ornaments; but that he knocked down the vast building and the other Babylonian temples, is incredible. Babylon always continued one of the chief cities of the Persian empire.

² What is stated in the text respecting Babylon, is taken almost entirely from Herodotus: I have given briefly the most prominent points in his interesting narrative (i. 178–193), which well deserves to be read at length.

Herodotus is in fact our only original witness, speaking from his own observation and going into details, respecting the marvels of Babylon. Ktésias, if his work had remained, would have been another original witness; but we have only a few extracts from him by Dio-

Besides this great town of Babylon itself, there were throughout the neighbourhood, between the canals which united the Euphrates

dorus. Strabo seems not to have visited Babylon, nor can it be affirmed that Kleitarchus did so. Arrian had Aristobulus to copy, and is valuable as far as he goes; but he does not enter into many particulars respecting the magnitude of the city or its appurtenances. Berosus also, if we possessed his book, would have been an eye-witness of the state of Babylon more than a century and a half later than Herodotus, but the few fragments remaining are hardly at all descriptive (see Berosi Fragm. p. 64-67, ed. Richter).

The magnitude of the works described by Herodotus naturally provokes suspicions of exaggeration. But there are good grounds for trusting him, in my judgement, on all points which fell under his own vision and means of verification—as distinguished from past facts, on which he could do no more than give what he heard. He had bestowed much attention on Assyria and its phenomena, as is evident from the fact that he had written (or prepared to write, if the suspicion be admissible that the work was never completed—Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc.* ii. 20, 5) a special Assyrian history, which has not reached us (*Ἀσσυρίοις λόγοισι*, i. 106-184). He is very precise in the measures of which he speaks; thus having described the dimensions of the walls in "royal cubits," he goes on immediately to tell us how much that measure differs from an ordinary cubit. He designedly suppresses a part of what he had heard respecting the produce of the Babylonian soil, from the mere apprehension of not being believed.

To these reasons for placing faith in Herodotus we may add another, not less deserving of attention. That which seems incredible in the constructions which he describes, arises simply from their enormous bulk, and the frightful quantity of human labour which must have been employed to execute them. He does not tell us, like Berosus (Fragm. p. 66), that these wonderful fortifications were completed in fifteen days—nor, like Quintus Curtius, that the length of one stadium was completed on each successive day of the year (v. 1, 26). To bring to pass all that Herodotus has described, is a mere question of time, patience, number of labourers, and cost of maintaining them—for the materials

were both close at hand and inexhaustible.

Now what would be the limit imposed upon the power and will of the old kings of Babylonia on these points? We can hardly assign that limit with so much confidence as to venture to pronounce a statement of Herodotus incredible, when he tells us something which he has seen, or verified from eye-witnesses. The pyramids and other works in Egypt are quite sufficient to make us mistrustful of our own means of appreciation; and the great wall of China (extending for 1200 English miles along what was once the whole northern frontier of the Chinese empire—from 20 to 25 feet high—wide enough for six horses to run abreast, and furnished with a suitable number of gates and bastions) contains more material than all the buildings of the British empire put together, according to Barrow's estimate (*Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. i. p. 7. t. v.; and Ideler, *Ueber die Zeitrechnung der Chinesen*, in the *Abhandlungen der Berlin Academy* for 1837, ch. 3. p. 291).

Ktésias gave the circuit of the walls of Babylon as 360 stadia; Kleitarchus, 365 stadia; Quintus Curtius, 368 stadia; and Strabo, 385 stadia; all different from Herodotus, who gives 480 stadia, a square of 120 stadia each side. Grosskurd (ad Strabon. xvi. p. 738), Letronne, and Heeren, all presume that the smaller number must be the truth, and that Herodotus must have been misinformed; and Grosskurd farther urges, that Herodotus cannot have seen the walls, inasmuch as he himself tells us that Darius caused them to be razed after the second siege and re-conquest (Herodot. iii. 159). But upon this we may observe—First, the expression (τὸ τεῖχος περιείλε) does not imply that the wall was so thoroughly and entirely razed by Darius as to leave no part standing,—still less that the great and broad moat was in all its circuit filled up and levelled. This would have been a most laborious operation in reference to such high and bulky masses, and withal not necessary for the purpose of rendering the town defenceless; for which purpose the destruction of certain portions of the wall is sufficient. Next, Herodotus speaks distinctly of the walls and ditch as existing in his time, when he saw the place; which does not exclude the possibility that numerous

and the Tigris, many rich and populous villages, while Borsippa and other considerable towns were situated lower down on the Euphrates itself. And the industry, agricultural as well as manufacturing, of the collective population was not less persevering than productive. Their linen, cotton, and woollen fabrics, and their richly ornamented carpets, were celebrated throughout all

breaches may have been designedly made in them, or mere openings left in the walls without any actual gates, for the purpose of obviating all idea of revolt. But however this latter fact may be, certain it is that the great walls were either continuous, or discontinuous only to the extent of these designed breaches, when Herodotus saw them. He describes the town and its phenomena in the *present tense*: *κείται ἐν πεδίῳ μεγάλῳ, μέγας ἐοῦσα μέτωπον ἑκαστον 120 σταδίων, ἐούσης τετραγώνου· οὔτοι στάδιοι τῆς περιόδου τῆς πόλιος γίνονται συνάπαντες 480. Τὸ μὲν νῦν μέγας τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τοῦ ἄστεος τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου. Ἐκεκρόσμητο δὲ ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλο πόλισμα τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν· ταφρὸς μὲν πρῶτά μιν βάθρα τε καὶ εὖρεα καὶ πλὴν ὕδατος περιθέει· μετὰ δὲ, τείχος πενήκοντα μὲν πηχέων βασιλιῶν ἐδὲν τὸ εὖρος, ὕψος δὲ, δικηοσίων πηχέων. Ὁ δὲ βασιλῆος πηχὺς τοῦ μετρίου ἐστὶ πῆχεος μέζων τρισὶ δακτυλίοισι (c. 178). Again (c. 181).—Τοῦτο μὲν δὴ τὸ τείχος θώρηξ ἐστὶ ἕτερον δὲ ἔσθωθεν τείχος περιθεῖ, οὐ πολλῷ τέφ ἀσθενέστερον τοῦ ἑτέρου τείχους, στενιόντερον δέ. Then he describes the temple of Zeus Bélus with its vast dimensions—καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ τοῦτο ἔτι ἐδὲν, δύο σταδίων πάντη, ἐδὲν τετραγώνον—in the language of one who had himself gone up to the top of it. After having mentioned the striking present phenomena of the temple, he specifies a statue of solid gold, twelve cubits high, which the Chaldeans told him had once been there, but which he did not see, and he carefully marks the distinction in his language—ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τεμένει τούτῳ ἔτι πρὶν χρόνον ἕκεινον καὶ ἀνδριάς δυάδεκα πῆχεων, χρύσεος στέρεος. Ἐγὼ μὲν μιν οὐκ εἶδον· τὰ δὲ λέγεται ὑπὸ Χαλδαίων, ταῦτα λέγω (c. 183).*

The argument therefore by which Grosskurd justifies the rejection of the statement of Herodotus is not to be reconciled with the language of the historian: Herodotus certainly saw both the walls and the ditch. Ktésias saw them too, and his statement of the circuit, as 360 stadia, stands opposed to that of 480 stadia, which appears in

Herodotus. But the authority of Herodotus is in my judgement so much superior to that of Ktésias, that I accept the larger figure as more worthy of credit than the smaller. Sixty English miles (speaking in round numbers) of circuit is doubtless a wonder, but forty-five miles in circuit is a wonder also: granting means and will to execute the lesser of these two, the Babylonian kings can hardly be supposed inadequate to the greater.

To me the height of these artificial mountains, called walls, appears even more astonishing than their length or breadth. Yet it is curious that on this point the two eye-witnesses, Herodotus and Ktésias, both agree, with only the difference between royal cubits and common cubits. Herodotus states the height at 200 royal cubits: Ktésias, at fifty fathoms, which are equal to 200 common cubits (Diod. ii. 7)—τὸ δὲ ὕψος, ὡς μὲν Κτησίας φησὶ, πενήκοντα ὀργυιῶν, ὡς δὲ ἔνιοι τῶν νεωτέρων ἔγραψαν, πηχῶν πενήκοντα. Olearius (ad Philostratum Vit. Apollon. Tyan. i. 25) shows plausible reason for believing that the more recent writers (*νεώτεροι*) cut down the dimensions stated by Ktésias simply because they thought such a vast height incredible. The difference between the royal cubit and the common cubit (as Herodotus on this occasion informs us) was three digits in favour of the former; his 200 royal cubits are thus equal to 337 feet 8 inches: Ktésias has not attended to the difference between royal cubits and common cubits, and his estimate therefore is lower than that of Herodotus by 37 feet 8 inches.

On the whole, I cannot think that we are justified, either by the authority of such counter-testimony as can be produced, or by the intrinsic wonder of the case, in rejecting the dimensions of the walls of Babylon as given by Herodotus.

Quintus Curtius states that a large proportion of the enclosed space was not occupied by dwellings, but sown and planted (v. 1, 26: compare Diodor. ii. 9).

the Eastern regions. Their cotton was brought in part from islands in the Persian Gulf. The flocks of sheep tended by the Arabian Nomads supplied them with wool finer even than that of Milêtus or Tarentum. Besides the Chaldæan order of priests, there seem to have been among them certain other tribes with peculiar hereditary customs. Thus there were three tribes, probably near the mouth of the river, who restricted themselves to the eating of fish alone; but we have no evidences of a military caste (like that in Egypt) nor any other hereditary profession.

In order to present any conception of what Assyria was, in the early days of Grecian history and during the two centuries preceding the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus in 536 B.C., we unfortunately have no witness earlier than Herodotus, who did not see Babylon until near a century after that event—about seventy years after its still more disastrous revolt and second subjugation by Darius. Babylonia had become one of the twenty satrapies of the Persian empire, and besides paying a larger regular tribute than any of the other nineteen, supplied, from its exuberant soil, provision for the Great King and his countless host of attendants during one-third part of the year.¹ Yet it was then in a state of comparative degradation, having had its immense walls breached by Darius, and having afterwards undergone the ill-usage of Xerxês; who, since he stripped its temples, and especially the venerated temple of Bêlus, of some of their richest ornaments, would probably be still more reckless in his mode of dealing with

Babylon—
only known
during the
time of its
degradation
—yet even
then the
first city in
Western
Asia.

the civic edifices.² If in spite of such inflictions, and in spite of that manifest evidence of poverty and suffering in the people which Herodotus expressly notices, it continued to be what he describes, still counted as almost the chief city of the Persian empire, both in the time of the younger Cyrus and in that of Alexander³—we may judge what it must once have been, without either foreign satrap or foreign tribute,⁴ under its Assyrian kings and Chaldæan priests, during the last of the two centuries which intervened between the æra of Nabonassar and the capture of the city by Cyrus the Great. Though several of the kings, during the first of these two centuries, had contributed much to the great works of Babylon, yet it was during the second century of the two, after the

¹ Herodot. i. 196.

² Arrian, Exp. Al. iii. 16, 6; vii. 17, 3; Quint. Curtius, iii. 3, 16.

³ Xenoph. Anab. i. 4, 11; Arrian, Exp. Al. iii. 16, 3. καὶ ἅμα τοῦ πολέμου τὸ ἄθλον ἢ Βαβυλῶν καὶ τὰ Σούσα ἐφαί-

νετο.

⁴ See the statement of the large receipts of the satrap Tritantæchmes, and his immense establishment of horses and Indian dogs (Herodot. i. 192).

capture of Nineveh by the Medes, and under Nebuchadnezzar and Nitôkris, that the kings attained the maximum of their power and the city its greatest enlargement. It was Nebuchadnezzar who constructed the seaport Terêdon, at the mouth of the Euphrates, and who probably excavated the long ship canal of near 400 miles, which joined it. That canal was perhaps formed partly from a natural western branch of the Euphrates.¹ The brother of the poet Alkæus—Antimenidas, who served in the Babylonian army, and distinguished himself by his personal valour (600-580 B.C.)—would have seen it in its full glory.² He is the earliest Greek of whom we hear individually in connexion with the Babylonians. It marks³ strikingly the contrast between the Persian kings and the Babylonian kings, on whose ruin they rose—that while the latter incurred immense expense to facilitate the communication between Babylon and the sea, the former artificially impeded the lower course of the Tigris, in order that their residence at Susa might be out of the reach of assailants.

That which strikes us most, and which must have struck the first Grecian visitors much more, both in Assyria and Egypt, is the unbounded command of naked human strength possessed by these early kings, and the effect of mere mass and indefatigable perseverance, unaided either by theory or by artifice, in the accomplishment of gigantic results.⁴ In Assyria the results were in great part exaggerations of enterprises in themselves useful to the people for irrigation and defence: religious worship was ministered to in the like manner, as well as the personal fancies and pomp of their kings: while in

Immense command of human labour possessed by the Babylonian kings.

¹ There is a valuable examination of the lower course of the Euphrates, with the changes which it has undergone, in Ritter, West-Asien, b. iii. Abtheil. iii. Abschnitt i. sect. 29. p. 45-49, and the passage from Abydenus in the latter page.

For the distance between Terêdon or Diridôtis, at the mouth of the Euphrates (which remained separate from that of the Tigris until the first century of the Christian era), to Babylon, see Strabo, ii. p. 80; xvi. p. 739.

It is important to keep in mind the warning given by Ritter, that none of the maps of the course of the river Euphrates, prepared previously to the publication of Colonel Chesney's expedition in 1836, are to be trusted. That expedition gave the first complete and accurate survey of the course of the river, and led to the detection of many mis-

takes previously committed by Mannert, Reichard, and other able geographers and chartographers. To the immense mass of information contained in Ritter's comprehensive and laborious work, is to be added the farther merit, that he is always careful in pointing out where the geographical data are insufficient and fall short of certainty. See West-Asien, B. iii. Abtheilung iii. Abschnitt i. sect. 41. p. 959.

² Strabo, xiii. p. 617, with the mutilated fragment of Alkæus, which O. Müller has so ingeniously corrected (Rhenisch. Museum, i. 4. p. 287).

³ Strabo, xvi. p. 740.

⁴ Diodor. (i. 31) states this point justly with regard to the ancient kings of Egypt—*ἔργα μέγала καὶ θαυμαστὰ διὰ τὰς πολυχειρίας κατασκευάσαντας, ἀθάνατα τῆς ἐαυτῶν δόξης καταλιπεῖν ὑπομνήματα.*

Egypt the latter class predominates more over the former. We scarcely trace in either of them the higher sentiment of art, which owes its first marked development to Grecian susceptibility and genius. But the human mind is in every stage of its progress, and most of all in its rude and unreflecting period, strongly impressed by visible and tangible magnitude, and awe-struck by the evidences of great power. To this feeling, for what exceeded the demands of practical convenience and security, the wonders both in Egypt and Assyria chiefly appealed. The execution of such colossal works demonstrates habits of regular industry, a concentrated population under one government, and above all, an implicit submission to the regal and priestly sway—contrasting forcibly with the small autonomous communities of Greece and Western Europe, wherein the will of the individual citizen was so much more energetic and uncontrolled. The acquisition of habits of regular industry, so foreign to the natural temper of man, was brought about in Egypt and Assyria, in China and Hindostan, before it had acquired any footing in Europe; but it was purchased either by prostrate obedience to a despotic rule, or by imprisonment within the chain of a consecrated institution of caste. Even during the Homeric period of Greece, these countries had

Collective
civilization
in Asia,
without in-
dividual free-
dom or de-
velopment.

attained a certain civilization in mass, without the acquisition of any high mental qualities or the development of any individual genius. The religious and political sanction, sometimes combined and sometimes separate, determined for every one his mode of life, his creed, his duties, and his place in society, without leaving any scope for the will or reason of the agent himself. Now the Phenicians and Carthaginians manifest a degree of individual impulse and energy which puts them greatly above this type of civilization, though in their tastes, social feelings and religion, they are still Asiatic. And even the Babylonian community—though their Chaldæan priests are the parallel of the Egyptian priests, with a less measure of ascendancy—combine with their industrial aptitude and constancy of purpose, something of that strenuous ferocity of character which marks so many people of the Semitic race—Jews, Phenicians, and Carthaginians. These Semitic people stand distinguished as well

Graduated
contrast
between
Egyptians,
Assyrians,
Phenicians,
and Greeks.

from the Egyptian life—enslaved by childish caprices and antipathies, and by endless frivolities of ceremonial detail—as from the flexible, many-sided, and self-organising Greek; the latter not only capable of opening both for himself and for the human race the highest walks of in-

tellect, and the full creative agency of art, but also gentler by far in his private sympathies and dealings than his contemporaries on the Euphrates, the Jordan, or the Nile—for we are not of course to compare him with the exigencies of Western Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Both in Babylonia and in Egypt, the vast monuments, embankments and canals, executed by collective industry, appeared the more remarkable to an ancient traveller by contrast with the desert regions and predatory tribes immediately surrounding them. West of the Euphrates, the sands of Arabia extended northward, with little interruption, to the latitude of the Gulf of Issus; they even covered the greater part of Mesopotamia,¹ or the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris, beginning a short distance northward of the wall called the wall of Media above-mentioned, which (extending in a direction nearly southward from the Tigris to the Euphrates) had been erected to protect Babylonia against the incursions of the Medes.² Eastward of the Tigris again, along the range of Mount Zagros, but at no great distance from the river, were found the Elymæi, Kossæi, Uxii, Parætakêni, &c.—tribes which (to use the expression of Strabo),³ “as inhabiting a poor country, were under the necessity of living by the plunder of their neighbours.” Such rude bands of depredators on the one side, and such wide tracts of sand on the two others, without vegetation or water, contrasted powerfully with the industry and productiveness of Babylonia. Babylon itself is to be considered, not as one continuous city, but as a city together with its surrounding district enclosed within immense walls, the height and thickness of which were in themselves a sufficient defence, so that the place was assailable only at its gates. In case of need it would serve as shelter for the persons and property of the village-inhabitants in Babylonia. We shall

Deserts and predatory tribes surrounding the Babylonians.

¹ See the description of this desert in Xenoph. Anab. i. 5, 1-8.

² The Ten Thousand Greeks passed from the outside to the inside of the wall of Media: it was 100 feet high, 20 feet wide, and was reported to them as extending 20 parasangs or 600 stadia (=70 miles) in length (Xenoph. Anab. ii. 4, 12). Eratosthenes called it τὸ Σεμυράμιδος διατέλχιμα (Strabo, ii. p. 80).

There is some confusion about the wall of Media; Mannert (Geogr. der G. und R. v. 2, p. 280) and Forbiger also (Alte Geogr. sect. 97, p. 616, note 94)

appear to have confounded the ditch dug by special order of Artaxerxês to oppose the march of the younger Cyrus with the Nahar-Malcha or Royal Canal between the Tigris and the Euphrates: see Xenoph. Anab. i. 7, 15.

It is singular that Herodotus makes no mention of the wall of Media, though his subject (i. 185) naturally conducts him to it. The little information which can be found about it, will be seen put together in Ch. 70; where I recount the Expedition of Cyrus.

³ Strabo, xvi. p. 744.

see hereafter how useful under trying circumstances such a resource was, when we come to review the invasions of Attica by the Peloponnesians, and the mischiefs occasioned by a temporary crowd pouring in from the country, so as to overcharge the intramural accommodations of Athens. Spacious as Babylon was, however, it is affirmed by Strabo that Ninus or Nineveh was considerably larger.

APPENDIX.

Since the first edition of these volumes, the interesting work of Mr. Layard—"Nineveh and its Remains," together with his illustrative Drawings—"The Monuments of Nineveh"—have been published. And through his unremitting valuable exertions in surmounting all the difficulties connected with excavations on the spot, the British Museum has been enriched with a valuable collection of real Assyrian sculptures and other monuments. A number of similar relics of Assyrian antiquity, obtained by M. Botta and others, have also been deposited in the museum of the Louvre at Paris.

In respect to Assyrian art, indeed to the history of art in general, a new world has thus been opened, which promises to be fruitful of instruction; especially when we consider that the ground out of which the recent acquisitions have been obtained, has been yet most imperfectly examined, and may be expected to yield an ampler harvest hereafter, assuming circumstances tolerably favourable to investigation. The sculptures to which we are now introduced, with all their remarkable peculiarities of style and idea, must undoubtedly date from the eighth or seventh century B.C. at the latest—and may be much earlier. The style which they display forms a parallel and subject of comparison, though in many points extremely different, to that of early Egypt—at a time when the ideal combinations of the Greeks were, as far as we know, embodied only in epic and lyric poetry.

But in respect to early Assyrian history, we have yet to find out whether much new information can be safely deduced from these interesting monuments. The cuneiform inscriptions now brought to light are indeed very numerous: and if they can be deciphered, on rational and trustworthy principles, we can hardly fail to acquire more or less of positive knowledge respecting a period now plunged in total darkness. But from the monuments of art alone, it would be unsafe to draw historical inferences. For example, when we find sculptures representing a king taking a city by assault, or receiving captives brought to him, &c., we are not to conclude that this commemorates any real and positive conquest recently made by the Assyrians. Our knowledge of the subjects of Greek sculpture on temples is quite sufficient to make us disallow any such inference, unless there be some corroborative proof. Some means must first be discovered, of discriminating historical from mythical subjects: a distinction which I here notice, the rather, because Mr. Layard shows occasional tendency to overlook it in his interesting remarks and explanations: see especially, vol. ii. ch. vi. p. 409.

From the rich and abundant discoveries made at Nimroud, combined with those at Kouyunjik and Khorsabad, Mr. Layard is inclined to comprehend all these three within the circuit of ancient Nineveh; admitting for that circuit the prodigious space alleged by Diodorus out of Ktésias, 480 stadia or above fifty English

miles. (See Nineveh and its Remains, vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 242-253.) Mr. Layard considers that the north-west portion of Nimroud exhibits monuments more ancient, and at the same time better in style and execution, than the south-west portion,—or than Kouyunjik and Khorsabad (vol. ii. ch. i. p. 204; ch. iii. p. 305). If this hypothesis, as to the ground covered by Nineveh, be correct, probably future excavations will confirm it—or, if incorrect, refute it. But I do not at all reject the supposition on the simple ground of excessive magnitude: on the contrary, I should at once believe the statement, if it were reported by Herodotus after a visit to the spot, like the magnitude of Babylon. The testimony of Ktésias is indeed very inferior in value to that of Herodotus: yet it ought hardly to be outweighed by the supposed improbability of so great a walled space, when we consider how little we know where to set bounds to the power of the Assyrian kings in respect to command of human labour for any process merely simple and toilsome, with materials both near and inexhaustible. Not to mention the great wall of China, we have only to look at the Picts Wall, and other walls built by the Romans in Britain, to satisfy ourselves that a great length of fortification, under circumstances much less favourable than the position of the ancient Assyrian kings, is noway incredible in itself. Though the walls of Nineveh and Babylon were much *larger* than those of Paris as it now stands, yet when we compare the two not merely in size, but in respect of costliness, elaboration, and contrivance, the latter will be found to represent an infinitely greater *amount of work*.

Larissa and Mespila, those deserted towns and walls which Xenophon saw in the retreat of the Ten Thousand (Anab. iii. 4, 6-10), coincide in point of distance and situation with Nimroud and Kouyunjik, according to Mr. Layard's remark. And his supposition seems not improbable, that both of them were formed by the Medes out of the ruins of the conquered city of Nineveh. Neither of them singly seems at all adequate to the reputation of that ancient city, or walled circuit. According to the account of Herodotus, Phraortes the second Median king had attacked Nineveh, but had been himself slain in the attempt, and lost nearly all his army. It was partly to revenge this disgrace that Kyaxarés son of Phraortes assailed Nineveh (Herod. i. 102-103): we may thus see a special reason, in addition to his own violence of temper (i. 73), why he destroyed the city after having taken it (*Νίῳν ἀναστράτου γενομένης*, i. 178). It is easy to conceive that this vast walled space may have been broken up and converted into two Median towns, both on the Tigris. In the subsequent change from Median to Persian dominion, these towns also became depopulated, as far as the strange tales which Xenophon heard in his retreat can be trusted. The interposition of these two Median towns doubtless contributed, for the time, to put out of sight the traditions respecting the old Ninus which had before stood upon their site. But such traditions never became extinct, and a new town bearing the old name of Ninus must have subsequently arisen on the spot. This second Ninus is recognised by Tacitus, Ptolemy, and Ammianus, not only as existing, but as pretending to uninterrupted continuity of succession from the ancient "*caput Assyriæ*."

Mr. Layard remarks on the facility with which edifices, such as those in Assyria, built of sunburnt bricks, perish when neglected, and crumble away into earth, leaving little or no trace.

CHAPTER XX.

EGYPTIANS.

IF, on one side, the Phenicians were separated from the productive Babylonia by the Arabian Desert, on the other side, the western portion of the same desert divided them from the no less productive valley of the Nile. In those early times which preceded the rise of Greek civilization, their land trade embraced both regions, and they served as the sole agents of international traffic between the two. Conveniently as their towns were situated for maritime commerce with the Nile, Egyptian jealousy had excluded Phenician vessels not less than those of the Greeks from the mouths of that river, until the reign of Psammetichus (672-618 B.C.); and thus even the merchants of Tyre could then reach Memphis only by means of caravans, employing as their instruments (as I have already observed) the Arabian tribes,¹ alternately plunderers and carriers.

Respecting Egypt, as respecting Assyria, since the works of Herodotus —earliest Grecian informant about Egypt. Hekataëus are unfortunately lost, our earliest information is derived from Herodotus, who visited Egypt about two centuries after the reign of Psammetichus, when it formed part of one of the twenty Persian satrapies. The Egyptian marvels and peculiarities which he recounts, are more numerous as well as more diversified, than the Assyrian; and had the vestiges been effaced as completely in the former as in the latter, his narrative would probably have met with an equal degree of suspicion. But the hard stone, combined with the dry climate of Upper Egypt (where a shower of rain counted as a prodigy), have given such permanence to the monuments in the valley of the Nile, that enough has remained to bear out the father of Grecian history, and to show, that in describing what he professes to have

¹ Strabo, xvi. p. 766, 776, 778; Pliny, H. N. vi. 32. "Arabes, mirum dictu, ex innumeris populis pars æqua in commerciis aut latrociniiis degunt: in universum gentes ditissimæ, ut apud quas maximæ opes Romanorum Parthorumque subsistant—vendentibus quæ a mari

aut sylvis capiunt, nihil invicem redimentibus."

The latter part of this passage of Pliny presents an enunciation sufficiently distinct, though by implication only, of what has been called the *mercantile theory* in political economy.

seen, he is a guide perfectly trustworthy. For that which he heard, he appears only in the character of a reporter, and often an incredulous reporter. Yet though this distinction between his hearsay and his ocular evidence is not only obvious, but of the most capital moment¹—it has been too often neglected by those who depreciate him as a witness.

The mysterious river Nile, a god² in the eyes of ancient Egyptians, and still preserving both its volume and its usefulness undiminished amidst the general degradation of the country, reached the sea in the time of Herodotus by five natural mouths, besides two others artificially dug. Its Pelusiatic branch formed the eastern boundary of Egypt, its Kanôpic branch (170 miles distant) the western; while the Sebennytic branch was a continuation of the straight line of the upper river: from this latter branched off the Saitic and the Mendesian arms.³ The overflowings of the Nile are far more fertilising than those of the Euphrates in Assyria,—partly from their more uniform recurrence both in time and quantity, partly from the rich silt which they bring down and deposit, whereas the Euphrates served only as moisture. The patience of the Egyptians had excavated, in Middle Egypt, the vast reservoir (partly, it seems, natural and pre-existing) called the Lake of Mœris—and in the Delta, a net-

The Nile in
the time of
Herodotus.

¹ To give one example:—Herodotus mentions an opinion given to him by the γραμματιστής (comptroller) of the property of Athênê at Sais, to the effect that the sources of the Nile were at an immeasurable depth in the interior of the earth, between Syênê and Elephantinê, and that Psammetichus had vainly tried to sound them with a rope many thousand fathoms in length (ii. 28). In mentioning this tale (perfectly deserving of being recounted at least, because it came from a person of considerable station in the country), Herodotus expressly says,—“this comptroller seemed to me to be only bantering, though he professed to know accurately”—οὗτος δὲ ἐμολίγε παίζειν ἐδόκει, φάμενος εἰδέναι ἀτρεκέως. Now Strabo (xvii. p. 819), in alluding to this story, introduces it just as if Herodotus had told it for a fact—Πολλὰ δ' Ἡρόδοτος τε καὶ ἄλλοι φλυαροῦσιν, οἶον, &c.

Many other instances might be cited, both from ancient and modern writers, of similar carelessness or injustice towards this admirable author.

² Οἱ ἱερεῖς τοῦ Νείλου, Herod. ii. 90. The water of the Nile is found, on chemical analysis, to be of remarkable

purity. It was supposed also by the Egyptian priests to have a fattening property. In their eyes, all fat, flesh, or superfluous excrescence (such as hair or nails) on the body, was impure. Accordingly the bull Apis was not allowed to drink out of the Nile, lest he should become fat; but had a well especially sunk for him (Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. c. 5. p. 353, with the note of Parthey, in his recent edition of that treatise, p. 161).

³ The seven mouths of the Nile, so notorious in antiquity, are not conformable to the modern geography of the country: see Mannert, Geogr. der Gr. und Röm. x. i. p. 539.

The breadth of the base of the Delta, between Pelusium and Kanôpus, is overestimated by Herodotus (ii. 6–9) at 3600 stadia; Diodorus (i. 34) and Strabo give 1300 stadia, which is near the truth, though the text of Strabo in various passages is not uniform on this matter, and requires correction. See Grosskurd's note on Strabo, ii. p. 64 (note 3. p. 101), and xvii. p. 186 (note 9. p. 332). Pliny gives the distance at 170 miles (H. N. v. 9).

work of numerous canals. Yet on the whole the hand of man had been less tasked than in Babylonia; whilst the soil, annually enriched, yielded its abundant produce without either plough or spade to assist the seed cast in by the husbandman.¹ That under these circumstances a dense and regularly organised population should have been concentrated in fixed abodes along the valley occupied by this remarkable river, is no matter of wonder. The marked peculiarities of the locality seem to have brought about such a result, in the earliest periods to which human society can be traced. Along the 550 miles of its undivided course from Syênê to Memphis, where for the most part the mountains leave only a comparatively narrow strip on each bank—as well as in the broad expanse between Memphis and the Mediterranean—there prevailed a peculiar form of theocratic civilization, from a date which even in the time of Herodotus was immemorially ancient. But if we seek for some measure of this antiquity, earlier than the time when Greeks were first admitted into Egypt in the reign of Psammetichus, we find only the computations of the priests, reaching back for many thousand years, first of government by immediate and present gods, next of human kings. Such computations have

¹ Herod. i. 193. Παραγίνεται δ σίτος (in Babylonia) οὐ, κατὰπερ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποτάμου ἀναβαίνοντος ἐς τὰς ἀρούρας, ἀλλὰ χερσὶ τε καὶ κηλωνήτοισι ἀρδόμενος· ἡ γὰρ Βαβυλωνίη χώρα πᾶσα, κατὰπερ ἡ Αἰγυπτίη, κατατέμνεται ἐς διωρύχας, &c.

Herodotus was informed that the canals in Egypt had been dug by the labour of that host of prisoners whom the victorious Sesostris brought home from his conquests (ii. 108). The canals in Egypt served the purpose partly of communication between the different cities, partly of a constant supply of water to those towns which were not immediately on the Nile: "that vast river, so constantly at work," (to use the language of Herodotus—ὑπὸ τοσοῦτου τε ποτάμου καὶ οὕτως ἐργατικοῦ, ii. 11,) spared the Egyptians all the toil of irrigation which the Assyrian cultivator underwent (ii. 14).

Lower Egypt, as Herodotus saw it, though a continued flat, was unfit either for horse or car, from the number of intersecting canals—ἄνιπτος καὶ ἀναμάξεντος (ii. 108). But Lower Egypt, as Volney saw it, was among the countries in the world best suited to the action of cavalry, so that he pronounces the native population of the country to

have no chance of contending against the Mamelukes (Volney, Travels in Egypt and Syria, vol. i. ch. 12, sect. 2. p. 199). The country has reverted to the state in which it was (ἱππασίμη καὶ ἀμαξουμένη πᾶσα) before the canals were made—one of the many striking illustrations of the difference between the Egypt which a modern traveller visits, and that which Herodotus and even Strabo saw—ἄλην πλωτὴν διωρύγων ἐπὶ διωρύξει τμηθεισῶν (Strabo, xvii. p. 788).

Considering the early age of Herodotus, his remarks on the geological character of Egypt as a deposit of the accumulated mud by the Nile, appear to me most remarkable (ii. 8-14). Having no fixed number of years included in his religious belief as measuring the past existence of the earth, he carries his mind back without difficulty to what may have been effected by this river in 10,000 or 20,000 years, or "in the whole space of time elapsed before I was born" (ii. 11). So also, Anaxagoras (Fragm. p. 179, Schaub.) entertained just views about the cause of the rising of the Nile, though Herodotus did not share his views.

About the lake of Mœris, see a note a little farther on.

been transmitted to us by Herodotus, Manetho, and Diodorus¹—agreeing in their essential conception of the fore-time, with gods in the first part of the series and men in the second, but differing materially in events, names, and epochs. Probably, if we possessed lists from other Egyptian temples, besides those which Manetho drew up at Heliopolis or which Herodotus learnt at Memphis, we should find discrepancies from both these two. To compare these lists, and to reconcile them as far as they admit of being reconciled, is interesting as enabling us to understand the Egyptian mind, but conducts to no trustworthy chronological results, and forms no part of the task of an historian of Greece.

To the Greeks Egypt was a closed world before the reign of Psammetichus, though after that time it gradually became an important part of their field both of observation and action. The astonishment which the country created in the mind of the earliest Grecian visitors may be learnt even from the narrative of Herodotus, who doubtless knew it by report long before he went there. Both the physical and moral features of Egypt stood in strong contrast with Grecian experience. “Not only (says Herodotus) does the climate differ from all other climates, and the river from all other rivers, but Egyptian laws and customs are opposed on almost all points to those of other men.”² The Delta was at that time full of large and populous cities,³ built on artificial elevations of ground and seemingly not much inferior to Memphis itself, which was situated on the left bank of the Nile (opposite to the site of the modern Cairo), a little higher up than the spot where the Delta begins. From the time when the Greeks first became cognizant of Egypt, to the building of Alexandria and the reign of the Ptolemies, Memphis was the first city in Egypt. Yet it seems not to have been always so; there had been an earlier period when Thebes was the seat of Egyptian power, and Upper Egypt of far more consequence than Middle Egypt. Vicinity to the Delta,

Thebes and Upper Egypt —of more importance in early times than Lower Egypt, but not so in the days of Herodotus.

¹ See note in Appendix to this chapter.

² Herodot. ii. 35. Αἰγύπτιοι ἔμα τῷ οὐρανῷ τῷ κατὰ σφέας ἔδντι ἑτεροῖσι, καὶ τῷ ποτάμῳ φύσιν ἀλλοίην παρεχομένῳ ἢ οἱ ἄλλοι πόταμοι, τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ἔμπαλιν τοῖσι ἔλλοισι ἀνθρώποισι ἐστήσαντο ἥθεα καὶ νόμους.

³ Theokritus (Idyll. xvii. 83) celebrates Ptolemy Philadelphus king of Egypt as ruling over 33,333 cities: the manner in which he strings these figures into three hexameter verses is some-

what ingenious. The priests, in describing to Herodotus the unrivalled prosperity which they affirmed Egypt to have enjoyed under Amasis, the last king before the Persian conquest, said that there were then 20,000 cities in the country (ii. 177). Diodorus tells us that 18,000 different cities and considerable villages were registered in the Egyptian ἀναγραφῇ (i. 31) for the ancient times, but that 30,000 were numbered under the Ptolemies.

which must always have contained the largest number of cities and the widest surface of productive territory, probably enabled Memphis to usurp this honour from Thebes; and the predominance of Lower Egypt was still farther confirmed when Psammetichus introduced Ionian and Karian troops as his auxiliaries in the government of the country. But the stupendous magnitude of the temples and palaces, the profusion of ornamental sculpture and painting, the immeasurable range of sepulchres hewn in the rocks still remaining as attestations of the grandeur of Thebes—not to mention Ombi, Edfu and Elephantinê—show that Upper Egypt was once the place to which the land-tax from the productive Delta was paid, and where the kings and priests who employed it resided. It has been even contended that Thebes itself was originally settled by immigrants from still higher regions of the river; and the remains, yet found along the Nile in Nubia, are analogous, both in style and in grandeur, to those in the Thebais.¹ What is remarkable is, that both the one and the other are strikingly distinguished from the Pyramids, which alone remain to illustrate the site of the ancient Memphis. There are no pyramids either in Upper Egypt or in Nubia; but on the Nile above Nubia, near the Ethiopian Meroë, pyramids in great number, though of inferior dimensions, are again found.

From whence, or in what manner, Egyptian institutions first took their rise, we have no means of determining. Yet there seems little to bear out the supposition of Heeren² and other

¹ Respecting the monuments of ancient Egyptian art, see the summary of O. Müller, *Archäologie der Kunst*, sect. 215–233, and a still better account and appreciation of them in Carl Schnaase, *Geschichte der Bildenden Künste bey den Alten*, Düsseldorf, 1843, vol. i. book ii. ch. 1 and 2.

In regard to the credibility and value of Egyptian history anterior to Psammetichus, there are many excellent remarks by Mr. Kenrick, in the preface to his work, ‘*The Egypt of Herodotus*’ (the second book of Herodotus, with notes). About the recent discoveries derived from the hieroglyphics, he says, “We know that it was the custom of the Egyptian kings to inscribe the temples and obelisks which they raised with their own names or with distinguishing hieroglyphics; but in no one instance do these names as read by the modern decipherers of hieroglyphics on monuments said to have been raised by kings before Psammetichus, correspond with

the names given by Herodotus.” (Preface, p. xlv.) He farther adds in a note, “A name which has been read phonetically *Mena*, has been found at Thebes, and Mr. Wilkinson supposes it to be Menes. It is remarkable, however, that the names which follow are not phonetically written, so that it is probable that this is not to be read *Mena*. Besides, the cartouche, which immediately follows, is that of a king of the eighteenth dynasty; so that, at all events, it cannot have been engraved till many centuries after the supposed age of Menes; and the occurrence of the name no more decides the question of historical existence than that of Cærops in the Parian Chronicle.”

² Heeren, *Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt*, part ii. 1. p. 403. The opinion given by Parthey, however (*De Phillis Insulâ*, p. 100, Berlin, 1830), may perhaps be just: “*Antiquissimâ ætate eundem populum, dicamus Ægyptiacum, Nili ripas inde a Meroë insulâ*

eminent authors, that they were transmitted down the Nile by Ethiopian colonists from Meroë. Herodotus certainly conceived Egyptians and Ethiopians (who in his time jointly occupied the border island of Elephantinê, which he had himself visited) as completely distinct from each other, in race and customs not less than in language; the latter being generally of the rudest habits, of great stature, and still greater physical strength—the chief part of them subsisting on meat and milk, and blest with unusual longevity. He knew of Meroë, as the Ethiopian metropolis and a considerable city, fifty-two days' journey higher up the river than Elephantinê. But his informants had given him no idea of analogy between its institutions and those of Egypt.¹ He states that the migration of a large number of the Egyptian military caste, during the reign of Psammetichus, into Ethiopia, had first communicated civilised customs to these southern barbarians. If there be really any connexion between the social phenomena of Egypt and those of Meroë, it seems more reasonable to treat the latter as derivative from the former.²

The population of Egypt was classified into certain castes or hereditary professions; of which the number was not exactly defined, and is represented differently by different authors. The priests stand clearly marked out, as the order richest, most powerful, and most venerated. Distributed all over the country, they possessed exclusively the means of reading and writing,³ besides a vast amount of narrative matter treasured

Egyptian
castes or
hereditary
professions.

usque ad Ægyptum inferiorem occupasse, e monumentorum congruentiâ apparet: posteriore tempore, tabulis et annalibus nostris longe superiore, alia stirps Æthiopica interiora terræ usque ad cataractam Syenensem obtinuit. Ex quâ ætate certa rerum notitia ad nos pervenit, Ægyptiorum et Æthiopum segregatio jam facta est. Herodotus cæterique scriptores Græci populos acute discernunt."

At this moment, Syênê and its cataract mark the boundary of two people and two languages—Egyptians and Arabic language to the north, Nubians and Berber language to the south (Parthey, *ibid.*).

¹ Compare Herodot. ii. 30-32; iii. 19-25; Strabo, xvi. p. 818. Herodotus gives the description of their armour and appearance as part of the army of Xerxes (vii. 69); they painted their bodies: compare Plin. H. N. xxxiii. 36. How little Ethiopia was visited in his time, may be gathered from the tenor

of his statements: according to Diodorus (i. 37), no Greeks visited it earlier than the expedition of Ptolemy Philadelphus—οὕτως ἕξενα ἦν τὰ περὶ τοὺς τόπους τούτους, καὶ παντελῶς ἐπικίνδυνα. Diodorus however is incorrect in saying that no Greek had ever gone as far southward as the frontier of Egypt: Herodotus certainly visited Elephantinê, probably other Greeks also.

The statements respecting the theocratical state of Meroë and its superior civilization come from Diodorus (iii. 2, 5, 7), Strabo (xvii. p. 822) and Pliny (H. N. vi. 29-33), much later than Herodotus. Diodorus seems to have had no older informants before him (about Ethiopia) than Agatharchides and Artemidorus, both in the second century B.C. (Diod. iii. 10).

² Wesseling ad Diodor. iii. 3.

³ Herodot. ii. 37. Θεοσέβεις δὲ περισσῶς ἔοντες μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, &c. He is astonished at the retentiveness of their memory; some of them

up in the memory; the whole stock of medical and physical knowledge then attainable, and those rudiments of geometry (or rather land-measuring) which were so often called into use in a country annually inundated. To each god, and to each temple, throughout Egypt, lands and other properties belonged, whereby the numerous bands of priests attached to him were maintained. It seems too that a farther portion of the lands of the kingdom was set apart for them in individual property, though on this point no certainty

is attainable. Their ascendancy, both direct and indirect, Priests.

over the minds of the people, was immense. They prescribed that minute ritual under which the life of every Egyptian, not excepting the king himself,¹ was passed, and which was for themselves more full of harassing particularities than for any one else.² Every day in the year belonged to some particular god; the priests alone knew to which. There were different gods in every Nome, though Isis and Osiris were common to all. The priests of each god constituted a society apart, more or less important, according to the comparative celebrity of the temple. The high priests of Hephæstos, whose dignity was said to have been transmitted from father to son through a series of 341 generations³ (commemorated by the like number of colossal statues, which Herodotus himself saw), were second in importance only to the king. The property of each temple included troops of dependents and slaves, who were stamped with "holy marks,"⁴ and who must have been numerous in order to suffice for the large buildings and their constant visitors.

Next in importance to the sacerdotal caste were the military caste or order, whose native name⁵ indicated that they stood on the left-hand of the king, while the priests occupied the right. They were classified into Kalasiries and

The military order.

had more stories to tell than any one whom he had ever seen (ii. 77-109; Diodor. i. 73).

The word *priest* conveys to a modern reader an idea very different from that of the Egyptian *ἱερείς*, who were not a profession, but an order, comprising many occupations and professions—Josephus the Jew was in like manner an *ἱερεὺς κατὰ γένος* (cont. Apion. c. 3). So also the Brahmins in British India are an order.

¹ Diodorus (i. 70-73) gives an elaborate description of the monastic strictness with which the daily duties of the Egyptian king were measured out by the priests: compare Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osirid.* p. 353, who refers to Heka-

tæus (probably Hekataeus of Abdêra) and Eudoxus. The priests represented that Psammeticus was the first Egyptian king who broke through the priestly canon limiting the royal allowance of wine: compare Strabo, xvii. p. 790.

The Ethiopian kings at Meroë are said to have been kept in the like pupillage by the priestly order, until a king named Ergamenês during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Egypt, emancipated himself and put the chief priest to death (Diodor. iii. 6).

² Herodot. ii. 82, 83.

³ Herodot. ii. 143.

⁴ Herodot. ii. 113. *στίγματα ἱερὰ*.

⁵ Herodot. ii. 30.

Hermotybii, who occupied lands in eighteen particular Nomes or provinces, principally in Lower Egypt. The Kalasiries had once amounted to 160,000 men, the Hermotybii to 250,000, when at the maximum of their population; but that highest point had long been past in the time of Herodotus. To each man of this soldier-caste was assigned a portion of land equal to about $6\frac{1}{2}$ English acres, free from any tax; but what measures were taken to keep the lots of land in suitable harmony with a fluctuating number of holders, we know not. The statement of Herodotus relates to a time long past and gone, and describes what was believed, by the priests with whom he talked, to have been the primitive constitution of their country anterior to the Persian conquest. The like is still more true respecting the statement of Diodorus;¹ who says that the territory of Egypt was divided into three parts—one part belonging to the king, another to the priests, and the remainder to the soldiers.² His language seems to intimate that every Nome was so divided, and even that the three portions were equal, though he does not expressly say so. The result of these statements, combined with the history of Joseph in the book of Genesis, seems to be, that the lands of the priests and the soldiers were regarded as privileged property and exempt from all burthens, while the remaining soil was considered as the property of the king, who however received from it a fixed proportion, one-fifth of the total produce, leaving the rest in the hands of the cultivators.³ We are told that Sethos, priest of the god Phtha (or Hephæstos) at Memphis and afterwards named King, oppressed the military caste and deprived them of their lands. In revenge for this they withheld from him their aid when Egypt was invaded by Sennacherib. Farther, in the reign of Psammetichus, a large number (240,000) of these soldiers migrated into Ethiopia from a feeling of discontent, leaving their wives and children behind them.⁴ It was Psammetichus who first introduced Ionian and Karian mercenaries into the country, and began innovations on the ancient Egyptian constitution; so that the disaffection towards him, on the part of the native soldiers, no longer permitted to serve as exclusive guards to the king, is not difficult to explain. The Kalasiries and Hermo-

¹ Herodot. i. 165, 166; Diodor. i. 73.

² Diodor. i. 73.

³ Besides this general rent or land-tax received by the Egyptian kings, there seem also to have been special crown-lands. Strabo mentions an island in the Nile (in the Thebaid) celebrated for the extraordinary excellence of its

date-palms; the whole of this island belonged to the kings, without any other proprietor: it yielded a large revenue, and passed into the hands of the Roman government in Strabo's time (xvii. p. 818).

⁴ Herodot. ii. 30–141.

tybii were interdicted from every description of art or trade. There can be little doubt that under the Persians their lands were made subject to the tribute. This may partly explain the frequent revolts which they maintained, with very considerable bravery, against the Persian kings.

Herodotus enumerates five other *races* (so he calls them) or castes, besides priests and soldiers¹—herdsmen, swineherds, tradesmen, interpreters, and pilots; an enumeration which perplexes us, inasmuch as it takes no account of the husbandmen, who must always have constituted the majority of the population. It is perhaps for this very reason that they are not comprised in the list—not standing out specially marked or congregated together, like the five above-named, and therefore not seeming to constitute a race apart. The distribution of Diodorus, who specifies (over and above priests and soldiers) husbandmen, herdsmen, and artificers, embraces much more completely the whole population.² It seems more the statement of a reflecting man, pushing out the principle of hereditary occupations to its consequences; (and the comments which the historian so abundantly interweaves with his narrative show that such was the character of the authorities which he followed;—while the list given by Herodotus comprises that which struck his observation. It seems that a certain proportion of the soil of the Delta consisted of marsh land, including pieces of habitable ground, but impenetrable to an invading enemy, and favourable only to the growth of papyrus and other aquatic plants. Other portions of the Delta, as well as of the upper valley in parts where it widened to the eastward, were too wet for the culture of grain, though producing the richest herbage, and eminently suitable to the race of Egyptian herdsmen, who thus divided the soil with the husbandmen.³ Herdsmen generally were held reputable; but the race of swineherds were hated and despised, from the extreme antipathy of all other Egyptians to the pig—which animal yet could not be altogether proscribed, because there were certain peculiar occasions on which it was imperative to offer him in sacrifice to Selênê or Dionysus. Herodotus acquaints us that the swineherds were interdicted from all

¹ Herodot. i. 164.

² Diodor. i. 74. About the Egyptian castes generally, see Heeren, *Ideen über den Verkehr der Alten Welt*, part ii. 2. p. 572–595.

³ See the citation from Maillet's *Travels in Egypt*, in Heeren, *Ideen*, p. 590; also Volney's *Travels*, vol. i. ch. 6. p. 77.

The expression of Herodotus—οἱ περὶ τὴν σπειρομένην Αἴγυπτον οἰκέουσι—indicates that the portion of the soil used as pasture was not inconsiderable.

The inhabitants of the marsh land were the most warlike part of the population (Thucyd. i. 110).

the temples, and that they always intermarried among themselves, other Egyptians disdaining such an alliance—a statement which indirectly intimates that there was no standing objection against intermarriage of the remaining castes with each other. The caste or race of interpreters began only with the reign of Psammetichus, from the admission of Greek settlers, then for the first time tolerated in the country. Though they were half Greeks, the historian does not note them as of inferior account, except as compared with the two ascendant castes of soldiers and priests. Moreover the creation of a new caste shows that there was no consecrated or unchangeable total number.

Those whom Herodotus denominates tradesmen (κῆπηλοι) are doubtless identical with the artisans (τεχνῖται) specified by Diodorus—the town population generally as distinguished from that of the country. During the three months of the year when Egypt was covered with water, festival days were numerous—the people thronging by hundreds of thousands, in vast barges, to one or other of the many holy places, combining worship and enjoyment.¹ In Egypt weaving was a trade, whereas in Greece it was the domestic occupation of females. Herodotus treats it as one of those reversals of the order of nature which were seen only in Egypt,² that the weaver staid at home plying his web while his wife went to market. The process of embalming bodies was elaborate and universal, giving employment to a large special class of men. The profusion of edifices, obelisks, sculpture and painting, all executed by native workmen, required a large body of trained sculptors,³ who in the mechanical branch of their business attained a high excellence. Most of the animals in Egypt

¹ Herodot. ii. 59, 60.

² Herodot. ii. 35; Sophocl. Œdip. Colon. 332: where the passage cited by the Scholiast out of Nymphodorus is a remarkable example of the habit of ingenious Greeks to represent all customs which they thought worthy of notice, as having emanated from the design of some great sovereign: here Nymphodorus introduces Sesostris as the author of the custom in question, in order that the Egyptians might be rendered effeminate.

³ The process of embalming is minutely described (Herod. ii. 85–90); the word which he uses for it is the same as that for salting meat and fish—*ταρίχευσις*: compare Strabo, xvi. p. 764.

Perfect exactness of execution, mastery of the hardest stone, and unde-

viating obedience to certain rules of proportion, are general characteristics of Egyptian sculpture. There are yet seen in their quarries obelisks not severed from the rock, but having three of their sides already adorned with hieroglyphics; so certain were they of cutting off the fourth side with precision (Schnaase, *Gesch. der Bild. Künste*, i. p. 428).

All the Nomes of Egypt, however, were not harmonious in their feelings respecting animals: particular animals were worshipped in some Nomes, which in other Nomes were objects even of antipathy, especially the crocodile (Herod. ii. 69; Strabo, xvii. p. 817: see particularly the fifteenth Satire of Juvenal).

were objects of religious reverence, and many of them were identified in the closest manner with particular gods. The order of priests included a large number of hereditary feeders and tenders of these sacred animals.¹ Among the sacerdotal order were also found the computers of genealogies, the infinitely subdivided practitioners in the art of healing, &c.,² who enjoyed good reputation, and were sent for as surgeons to Cyrus and Darius. The Egyptian city-population was thus exceedingly numerous, so that king Sethon, when called upon to resist an invasion without the aid of the military caste, might well be supposed to have formed an army out of "the tradesmen, the artisans, and the market-people."³ And Alexandria, at the commencement of the dynasty of the Ptolemies, acquired its numerous and active inhabitants at the expense of Memphis and the ancient towns of Lower Egypt.

The mechanical obedience and fixed habits of the mass of the Egyptian population (not priests or soldiers) was a point which made much impression upon Grecian observers. Solon is said to have introduced at Athens a custom prevalent in Egypt, whereby the Nomarch or chief of each Nome was required to investigate every man's means of living, and to punish with death those who did not furnish evidence of some recognised occupation.⁴ It does not seem that the institution of Caste in Egypt—though ensuring unapproachable ascendancy to the Priests and much consideration to the Soldiers—was attended with any such profound debasement to the rest as that which falls upon the lowest caste or Sudras in India. No such gulf existed between them as that between the 'Twice-born and the Once-born in the religion of Brahma. Yet those stupendous works, which form the permanent memorials of the country, remain at the same time as proofs of the oppressive exactions of the kings, and of the reckless caprice with which the lives as well as the contributions of the people were lavished. One hundred and twenty thousand Egyptians were said to have perished in the digging of the canal, which king Nekôs began but did not finish, between the Pelusian arm of the Nile and the Red Sea;⁵ while

Profound
submission of
the people.

Destructive
toil imposed
by the
great monu-
ments.

¹ Herodot. ii. 65–72; Diodor. i. 83–90; Plutarch, Isid. et Osir. p. 380.

Hasselquist identified all the birds carved on the Obelisk near Matarea (Heliopolis) (Travels in Egypt, p. 99).

² Herodot. ii. 82, 83; iii. 1, 129. It is one of the points of distinction between Egyptians and Babylonians that the latter had no surgeons or *iatarpoi*: they brought out the sick into the

market-place to profit by the sympathy and advice of the passers-by (Herodot. i. 197).

³ Herodot. ii. 141.

⁴ Herodot. iii. 177.

⁵ Herodot. ii. 158. Read the account of the foundation of Petersburg by Peter the Great:—"Au milieu de ces réformes, grandes et petites, qui faisaient les amusemens du czar, et de la

the construction of the two great pyramids, attributed to the kings Cheops and Chephrên, was described to Herodotus by the priests as a period of exhausting labour and extreme suffering to the whole Egyptian people. And yet the great Labyrinth¹ (said to have been built by the Dodekarchs) appeared to him a more stupendous work than the Pyramids, so that the toil employed upon it cannot have been less destructive. The moving of such vast masses of stone as were seen in the ancient edifices both of Upper and Lower Egypt, with the imperfect mechanical resources then existing, must have tasked the efforts of the people yet more severely than the excavation of the half-finished canal of Nekôs. Indeed the associations with which the Pyramids were connected, in the minds of those with whom Herodotus conversed, were of the most odious character. Such vast works, Aristotle observes, are suitable to princes who desire to consume the strength and break the spirit of their people. With Greek despots, perhaps such an intention may have been sometimes deliberately conceived. But the Egyptian kings may be presumed to have followed chiefly caprice or love of pomp—sometimes views of a permanent benefit to be achieved—as in the canal of Nekôs and the vast reservoir of Mœris,² with its channel joining the river—when they thus expended the physical strength and even the lives of their subjects.

Sanctity of animal life generally, veneration for particular

guerre terrible qui l'occupoit contre Charles XII., il jeta les fondemens de l'importante ville et du port de Pétersbourg, en 1714, dans un marais où il n'y avait pas une cabane. Pierre travailla de ses mains à la première maison: rien ne le rebuta: des ouvriers furent forcés de venir sur ce bord de la mer Baltique, des frontières d'Astrachan, des bords de la Mer Noire et de la Mer Caspienne. Il périt plus de cent mille hommes dans les travaux qu'il fallut faire, et dans les fatigues et la disette qu'on essuya: mais enfin la ville existe." (Voltaire, *Anecdotes sur Pierre le Grand*, in his *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. Paris, 1825, tom. xxxi. p. 491).

¹ Herodot. ii. 124-129. τὸν λέων τετραμένον ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον κακοῦ. (Diodor. i. 63, 64).

Περὶ τῶν Πυραμίδων (Diodorus observes) οὐδὲν ὄλως οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις, οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν, συμφωνεῖται. He then alludes to some of the discrepant stories about the date of the Pyramids, and the names of their

constructors. This confession, of the complete want of trustworthy information respecting the most remarkable edifices of Lower Egypt, forms a striking contrast with the statement which Diodorus had given (c. 44), that the priests possessed records, "continually handed down from reign to reign, respecting 470 Egyptian kings."

² It appears that the lake of Mœris is, at least in great part, a natural reservoir, though improved by art for the purposes wanted, and connected with the river by an artificial canal, sluices, &c. (Kenrick ad Herodot. ii. 149.)

"The lake still exists, of diminished magnitude, being about 60 miles in circumference, but the communication with the river has ceased." Herodotus gives the circumference as 3600 stadia, = between 400 and 450 miles.

I incline to believe that there was more of the hand of man in it than Mr. Kenrick supposes, though doubtless the receptacle was natural.

animals in particular Nomes, and abstinence on religious grounds from certain vegetables, were among the marked features of Egyptian life, and served pre-eminently to impress upon the country that air of singularity which foreigners like Herodotus remarked in it. The two specially marked bulls, called Apis at Memphis and Mnevis at Heliopolis, seemed to have enjoyed a sort of national worship.¹ The ibis, the cat, and the dog, were throughout most of the Nomes venerated during life, embalmed like men after death, and if killed, avenged by the severest punishment of the offending party: but the veneration of the crocodile was confined to the neighbourhood of Thebes and the lake of Mœris. Such veins of religious sentiment, which distinguished Egypt from Phenicia and Assyria not less than from Greece, were explained by the native priests after their manner to Herodotus; though he declines from pious scruples to communicate what was told to him.² They seem remnants continued from a very early stage of Fetichism—and the attempts of different persons, noticed in Diodorus and Plutarch, to account for their origin, partly by legends, partly by theory, will give little satisfaction to any one.³

Though Thebes first, and Memphis afterwards, were undoubtedly the principal cities of Egypt, yet if the dynasties of Manetho are at all trustworthy even in their general outline, the Egyptian kings were not taken uniformly either from one or the other. Manetho enumerates on the whole twenty-six different dynasties or families of kings, anterior to the conquest of the country by Kambysês—the Persian kings between Kambysês and Darius Nothus, down to the death of the latter in 405 B.C. constituting his twenty-seventh dynasty. Of these twenty-six dynasties, beginning with the year 5702 B.C., the first two are Thinites—the third and fourth, Memphites—the fifth, from the island of Elephantinê—the sixth, seventh and eighth, again Memphites—the ninth and tenth, Herakleopolites—the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth, Diospolites or Thebans—the

Egyptian
kings—
taken from
different
parts of the
country.

¹ Herodot. ii. 38–46, 65–72; iii. 27–30; Diodor. i. 83–90.

It is surprising to find Pindar introducing into one of his odes a plain mention of the monstrous circumstances connected with the worship of the goat in the Mendesian Nome (Pindar, *Fragm. Inc.* 179, ed. Bergk). Pindar had also dwelt, in one of his *Prosodia*, upon the mythe of the gods having disguised themselves as animals, when seeking

to escape Typhon: which was one of the tales told as an explanation of the consecration of animals in Egypt: see Pindar, *Fragm. Inc.* p. 61, ed. Bergk; Porphyr. *de Abstin.* iii. p. 251, ed. Rhoer.

² Herodot. ii. 65. Diodorus does not feel the same reluctance to mention these ἀπόρρητα (i. 86).

³ Diodor. i. 86, 87; Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osirid.* p. 377 *seq.*

fourteenth, Choites—the fifteenth and sixteenth, Hyksos or Shepherd Kings—the seventeenth, Shepherd Kings, overthrown and succeeded by Diospolites—the eighteenth (B.C. 1655-1327, in which is included Rameses the great Egyptian conqueror, identified by many authors with Sesostris, 1411 B.C.), nineteenth and twentieth, Diospolites—the twenty-first, Tanites—the twenty-second, Bubastites—the twenty-third, again Tanites—the twenty-fourth, Saïtes—the twenty-fifth, Ethiopians, beginning with Saba-kôn, whom Herodotus also mentions—the twenty-sixth, Saïtes, including Psammetichus, Nekôs, Apries or Uaphris, and Amasis or Amosis. We see by these lists, that according to the manner in which Manetho construed the antiquities of his country, several other cities of Egypt, besides Thebes and Memphis, furnished kings to the whole territory. But we cannot trace any correspondence between the Nomes which furnished kings, and those which Herodotus mentions to have been exclusively occupied by the military caste. Many of the separate Nomes were of considerable substantive importance, and had a marked local character each to itself, religious as well as political; though the whole of Egypt, from Elephantinê to Pelusium and Kanôpus, is said to have always constituted one kingdom, from the earliest times which the native priests could conceive.

We are to consider this kingdom as engaged, long before the time when Greeks were admitted into it,¹ in a standing caravan commerce with Phenicia, Palestine, Arabia, and Assyria. Ancient Egypt having neither vines nor olives, imported both wine and oil;² while it also needed especially the frankincense and aromatic products peculiar to Arabia, for its elaborate religious ceremonies. Towards the last quarter of the eighth century B.C. (a little before the time when the dynasty of the Mermnadæ in Lydia was commencing in the person of Gygês), we trace events tending to alter the relation which previously subsisted between these countries, by continued aggressions on the part of the Assyrian monarchs of Nineveh—Salmaneser and Sennacherib. The former having conquered and led into captivity the ten tribes of Israel, also attacked the Phenician towns on the adjoining coast: Sidon, Palæ-Tyros, and Akê yielded to him, but Tyre itself re-

¹ On this early trade between Egypt, Phenicia, and Palestine, anterior to any acquaintance with the Greeks, see Josephus cont. Apion. i. 12.

² Herodotus notices the large importation of wine into Egypt in his day, from all Greece as well as from Phenicia, as well as the employment

of the earthen vessels in which it had been brought for the transport of water, in the return journeys across the Desert (iii. 6).

In later times, Alexandria was supplied with wine chiefly from Laodikeia in Syria near the mouth of the Orontes (Strabo, xvi. p. 751).

sisted, and having endured for five years the hardships of a blockade with partial obstruction of its continental aqueducts, was enabled by means of its insular position to maintain independence. It was just at this period that the Grecian establishments in Sicily were forming, and I have already remarked that the pressure of the Assyrians upon Phenicia probably had some effect in determining that contraction of the Phenician occupations in Sicily which really took place (B.C. 730–720). Respecting Sennacherib, we are informed by the Old Testament that he invaded Judæa—and by Herodotus (who calls him king of the Assyrians and Arabians) that he assailed the pious king Sethos in Egypt: in both cases his army experienced a miraculous repulse and destruction. After this the Assyrians of Nineveh, either torn by intestine dissension, or shaken by the attacks of the Medes, appear no longer active; but about the year 630 B.C., the Assyrians or Chaldæans of Babylon manifest a formidable and increasing power. It is moreover during this century that the old routine of the Egyptian kings was broken through, and a new policy displayed towards foreigners by Psammetichus—which, while it rendered Egypt more formidable to Judæa and Phenicia, opened to Grecian ships and settlers the hitherto inaccessible Nile.

Herodotus draws a marked distinction between the history of Egypt before Psammetichus and the following period. The former Egyptian history not known before Psammetichus. he gives as the narration of the priests, without professing to guarantee it—the latter he evidently believes to be well-ascertained.¹ And we find that from Psammetichus downward, Herodotus and Manetho are in tolerable harmony, whereas even for the sovereigns occupying the last fifty years before Psammetichus, there are many and irreconcilable discrepancies between them;² but they both agree in stating that Psammetichus reigned fifty-four years.

So important an event, as the first admission of the Greeks into Egypt, was made, by the informants of Herodotus, to turn upon two prophecies. After the death of Sethos (priest of Hephæstos as well as king), who left no son, Egypt became divided among twelve kings, of whom Psammetichus was one. It was under this dodekarchy, according to Herodotus, that the marvellous labyrinth near the Lake of Mœris was constructed. The twelve lived and reigned for some time in perfect harmony. But a prophecy had been made known

¹ Herodot. ii. 147–154. ἀπὸ Ψαμμή-
τιχου—πάντα καὶ τὰ ὕστερον ἐπιστάμεθα
ἀτρεκέως.

² See these differences stated and con-
sidered in Boeckh, Manetho und die
Hundstern Periode, p. 326–336.

to them, that the one who should make libations in the temple of Hephæstos out of a brazen goblet, would reign over all Egypt. Now it happened that one day when they all appeared armed in that temple to offer sacrifice, the high priest brought out by mistake only eleven golden goblets instead of twelve; and Psammetichus, left without a goblet, made use of his brazen helmet as a substitute. Being thus considered, though unintentionally, to have fulfilled the condition of the prophecy, by making libations in a brazen goblet, he became an object of terror to his eleven colleagues, who united to despoil him of his dignity and drove him into the inaccessible marshes. In this extremity he sent to seek counsel from the oracle of Lêtô at Butô, and received for answer an assurance that "vengeance would come to him by the hands of brazen men showing themselves from the seaward." His faith was for the moment shaken by so startling a conception as that of brazen men for his allies. But the prophetic veracity of the priest at Butô was speedily shown, when an astonished attendant came to acquaint him in his lurking-place, that brazen men were ravaging the sea-coast of the Delta. It was a body of Ionian and Karian soldiers, who had landed for pillage; and the messenger who came to inform Psammetichus had never before seen men in an entire suit of brazen armour. That prince, satisfied that these were the allies whom the oracle had marked out for him, immediately entered into negotiation with the Ionians and Karians, enlisted them in his service, and by their aid in conjunction with his other partisans overpowered the other eleven kings—thus making himself the one ruler of Egypt.¹

Such was the tale by which the original alliance of an Egyptian king with Grecian mercenaries, and the first introduction of Greeks into Egypt, was accounted for and dignified. What followed is more authentic and more important. Psammetichus provided a settlement and lands for his new allies, on the Pelusiæ or eastern branch of the Nile, a little below Bubastis. The Ionians were planted on one side of the

Importance
of Grecian
mercenaries
to the Egyptian
kings—
cause of inter-
preters.

¹ Herodot. ii. 149–152. This narrative of Herodotus, however little satisfactory in an historical point of view, bears evident marks of being the genuine tale which he heard from the priests of Hephæstos. Diodorus gives an account more historically plausible, but he could not well have had any positive authorities for that period, and he gives us seemingly the ideas of Greek authors of the days of the Ptolemies. Psammetichus (he tells us), as one of the

twelve kings, ruled at Saïs and in the neighbouring part of the Delta: he opened a trade, previously unknown in Egypt, with Greeks and Phenicians, so profitable that his eleven colleagues became jealous of his riches and combined to attack him. He raised an army of foreign mercenaries and defeated his colleagues (Diodor. i. 66, 67). Polyænus gives a different story about Psammetichus and the Karian mercenaries (vii. 3).

river, the Karians on the other; and the place was made to serve as a military position, not only for the defence of the eastern border, but also for the support of the king himself against malcontents at home: it was called the Stratopeda, or the Camps.¹ He took pains moreover to facilitate the intercourse between them and the neighbouring inhabitants by causing a number of Egyptian children to be domiciled with them, in order to learn the Greek language. Hence sprung the Interpreters, who in the time of Herodotus constituted a permanent hereditary caste or breed.

Though the chief purpose of this first foreign settlement in Egypt, between Pelusium and Bubastis, was to create an independent military force, and with it a fleet, for the king,—yet it was of course an opening both for communication and traffic, to all Greeks and to all Phenicians, such as had never before been available. And it was speedily followed by the throwing open of the Kanôpic or westernmost branch of the river for the purposes of trade specially. According to a statement of Strabo, it was in the reign of Psammetichus that the Milesians with a fleet of thirty ships made a descent on that part of the coast, first built a fort in the immediate neighbourhood, and then presently founded the town of Naukratis on the right bank of the Kanôpic Nile. There is much that is perplexing in this affirmation of Strabo; but on the whole I am inclined to think that the establishment of the Greek factories and merchants at Naukratis may be considered as dating in the reign of Psammetichus²—Naukratis however must have been a city of

¹ Herodot. ii. 154.

² Strabo, xvii. p. 801. καὶ τὸ Μιλήσιων τείχος· πλεύσαντες γὰρ ἐπὶ Ψαμμητίχου τριάκοντα ναυσὶν Μιλήσιοι κατὰ Κυαξάρη (οὗτος δὲ τῶν Μήδων) κάτεσχον εἰς τὸ στόμα τὸ Βολβίτινον· εἰτ' ἐκβάντες ἐτείχισαν τὸ λεχθὲν κτίσμα· χρόνῳ δ' ἀναπλεύσαντες εἰς τὸν Ζαῖτικὸν νομὸν, κατανάμαχσαντες Ἰναρον, πόλιν ἐκτίσαν Ναύκρατιν οὐ πολὺ τῆς Σχεδίας ὑπερθεῖν.

What is meant by the allusion to Kyaxarês, or to Inarus, in this passage, I do not understand. We know nothing of any relations either between Kyaxarês and Psammetichus, or between Kyaxarês and the Milesians: moreover, if by κατὰ Κυαξάρη be meant in the time of Kyaxarês, as the translators render it, we have in immediate succession ἐπὶ Ψαμμητίχου—κατὰ Κυαξάρη, with the same meaning, which is (to say the least of it) a very awkward sentence.

The words οὗτος δὲ τῶν Μήδων look not unlike a comment added by some early reader of Strabo, who could not understand why Kyaxarês should be here mentioned, and who noted his difficulty in words which have subsequently found their way into the text. Then again Inarus belongs to the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars; at least we know no other person of that name than the chief of the Egyptian revolt against Persia (Thucyd. i. 114), who is spoken of as a "Libyan, the son of Psammetichus." The mention of Kyaxarês therefore here appears unmeaning, while that of Inarus is an anachronism: possibly the story that the Milesians founded Naukratis "after having worsted Inarus in a sea-fight," may have grown out of the etymology of the name Naukratis, in the mind of one who found Inarus the son of Psammetichus mentioned two centuries after-

Egyptian origin in which these foreigners were permitted to take up their abode—not a Greek colony, as Strabo would have us believe. The language of Herodotus seems rather to imply that it was king Amasis (between whom and the death of Psammetichus there intervened nearly half a century) who first allowed Greeks to settle at Naukratis. Yet on comparing what the historian tells us respecting the courtesan Rhodôpis and the brother of Sapphô the poetess, it is evident that there must have been both Greek trade and Greek establishments in that town long before Amasis came to the throne. We may consider then, that both the eastern and western mouths of the Nile became open to the Greeks in the days of Psammetichus: the former as leading to the head-quarters of the mercenary Greek troops in Egyptian pay—the latter for purposes of trade.

While this event afforded to the Greeks a valuable enlargement both of their traffic and of their field of observation, it seems to have occasioned an internal revolution in Egypt. The Nome of Bubastis, in which the new military settlement of foreigners was planted, is numbered among those occupied by the Egyptian military caste.¹ Whether their lands were in part taken away from them we do not know; but the mere introduction of such foreigners must have appeared an abomination, to the strong conservative feeling of ancient Egypt. And Psammetichus treated the native soldiers in a manner which showed of how much less account Egyptian soldiers had become, since the “brazen helmets” had got footing in the land. It had hitherto been the practice to distribute such portions of the military, as were on actual service, in three different posts: at Daphnê near Pelusium, on the north-eastern frontier—at Marea on the north-western frontier, near the spot where Alexandria was afterwards built—and at Elephantinê, on the southern or Ethiopian boundary. Psammetichus, having no longer occasion for their services on the eastern frontier, since the formation of the mercenary camp, accumulated them in greater number and detained them for an unusual time at the two other stations, especially at Elephantinê. Here, as Herodotus tells us, they remained for three years unrelieved. Diodorus adds that Psammetichus assigned to those native troops who fought conjointly with the mercenaries, the least honourable

Discontents and mutiny of the Egyptian military order.

wards, and identified the two Psammetichuses with each other.

The statement of Strabo has been copied by Steph. Byz. v. *Ναύκρατις*. Eusebius also announces (Chron. i. p. 168) the Milesians as the founders of

Naukratis, but puts the event at 753 B.C., during what he calls the Milesian thalassokraty: see Mr. Fynes Clinton ad ann. 732 B.C. in the *Fasti Hellenici*.

¹ Herodot. ii. 166.

post in the line. Discontent at length impelled them to emigrate in a body of 240,000 men into Ethiopia, leaving their wives and children behind in Egypt. No instances on the part of Psammetichus could induce them to return. This memorable incident,¹ which is said to have given rise to a settlement in the southernmost regions of Ethiopia, called by the Greeks the Automoli (though the emigrant soldiers still call themselves by their old Egyptian name), attests the effect produced by the introduction of the foreign mercenaries in lowering the position of the native military. The number of the emigrants however is a point noway to be relied upon. We shall presently see that there were enough of them left behind to renew effectively the struggle for their lost dignity.

It was probably with his Ionian and Karian troops that Psammetichus carried on those warlike operations in Syria which filled so large a proportion of his long and prosperous reign of fifty-four years.² He besieged the city of Azôtus in Syria for twenty-nine years, until he took it—the longest blockade which Herodotus had ever heard of. Moreover he was in that country when the destroying Scythian Nomads (who had defeated the Median king Kyaxarês and possessed themselves of Upper Asia) advanced to invade Egypt; a project which Psammetichus, by large presents, induced them to abandon.³

There were, however, yet more powerful enemies, against whom he and his son Nekôs (who succeeded him seemingly about 604 B.C.⁴) had to contend in Syria and the lands adjoining. It is

¹ Herodot. ii. 30; Diodor. i. 67.

² Ἀπρίης—ὃς μετὰ Ψαμμήτιχον τὸν ἐϋωτοῦ προπάτορα ἐγένετο εὐδαιμονέστατος τῶν πρότερον βασιλέων (Herodot. ii. 161).

³ Herodot. i. 105; ii. 157.

⁴ The chronology of the Egyptian kings from Psammetichus to Amasis is given in some points differently by Herodotus and by Manetho:—

According to Herodotus,

Psammetichus reigned	54 years.
Nekôs "	16 "
Psammis "	6 "
Apriês "	25 "
Amasis "	44 "

According to Manetho ap. African.

Psammetichus reigned	54 years.
Nechao II. . . . "	6 "
Psammathis "	6 "
Uaphris "	19 "
Amosis "	44 "

Diodorus gives 22 years for Apriês and 55 years for Amasis (i. 68).

Now the end of the reign of Amasis stands fixed for 526 B.C., and therefore the beginning of his reign (according to both Herodotus and Manetho) to 570 B.C. or 569 B.C. According to the chronology of the Old Testament, the battles of Megiddo and Carchemisch, fought by Nekôs, fall about 609-605 B.C., and this coincides with the reign of Nekôs as dated by Herodotus, but

not as dated by Manetho. On the other hand, it appears from the evidence of certain Egyptian inscriptions recently discovered, that the real interval from the beginning of Nechao to the end of Uaphris is only forty years, and not forty-seven years, as the dates of Herodotus would make it (Boeckh, *Manetho und die Hundstern-Periode*, p. 341-348), which would place the accession of Nekôs in 610 or 609 B.C. Boeckh discusses at some length this

just at this period, during the reigns of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 625-561) that the Chaldeans or Assyrians of Babylon appear at the maximum of their power and aggressive disposition; while the Assyrians of Ninus or Nineveh lose their substantive position through the taking of that town by Kyaxarês (about B.C. 600)—the greatest height which the Median power ever reached. Between the Egyptian Nekôs and his grandson Apriês (Pharaoh Necho and Pharaoh Hophra of the Old Testament) on the one side, and the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar on the other, Judæa and Phenicia form the intermediate subject of quarrel. The political independence of the Phenician towns is extinguished never again to be recovered. At the commencement of his reign, it appears, Nekôs was chiefly anxious to extend the Egyptian commerce, for which purpose he undertook two measures, both of astonishing boldness for that age—a canal between the lower part of the eastern or Pelusiac Nile and the inmost corner of the Red Sea—and the circumnavigation of Africa; his great object being to procure a water-communication between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. He began the canal (much about the same time as Nebuchadnezzar executed his canal from Babylon to Terêdon) with such reckless determination, that 120,000 Egyptians are said to have perished in the work. But either from such disastrous proof of the difficulty, or (as Herodotus represents) from the terrors of a menacing prophecy which reached him, he was compelled to desist. Next he accomplished the circumnavigation of Africa, already above alluded to; but in this way too he found it impracticable to procure any available communication such as he wished.¹ It is plain that in both these enterprises he was acting under Phenician and Greek instigation; and we may remark that the point of the Nile, from whence the canal took its departure, was close upon the mercenary

Nekôs—son of Psammetichus—his active operations.

discrepancy of dates, and inclines to the supposition that Nekôs reigned nine or ten years jointly with his father, and that Herodotus has counted these nine or ten years twice, once in the reign of Psammetichus, once in that of Nekôs. Certainly Psammetichus can hardly have been very young when his reign began, and if he reigned fifty-four years, he must have reached an extreme old age, and may have been prominently aided by his son. Adopting the suppositions therefore that the last ten years of the reign of Psammetichus may be reckoned both for him and for Nekôs—that for Nekôs separately only

six years are to be reckoned—and that the number of years from the beginning of Nekôs's separate reign to the end of Uaphris is forty—Boeckh places the beginning of Psammetichus in 654 B.C., and not in 670 B.C., as the data of Herodotus would make it (*ib.* p. 342-350).

Mr. Clinton, *Fast. Hellen.* B.C. 616, follows Herodotus.

¹ Herodot. ii. 158. Respecting the canal of Nekôs, see the explanation of Mr. Kenrick on this chapter of Herodotus. From Bubastis to Suez the length would be about ninety miles.

camps or Stratopeda. Being unable to connect the two seas together, he built and equipped an armed naval force both upon the one and the other, and entered upon aggressive enterprises, naval as well as military. His army, on marching into Syria, was met at Megiddo (Herodotus says Magdolum) by Josiah king of Judah, who was himself slain and so completely worsted, that Jerusalem fell into the power of the conqueror, and became tributary to Egypt. It deserves to be noted that Nekôs sent the raiment which he had worn on the day of this victory as an offering to the holy temple of Apollo at Branchidæ near Milêtus¹—the first recorded instance of a donation from an Egyptian king to a Grecian temple, and a proof that Hellenic affinities were beginning to take effect upon him. Probably we may conclude that a large proportion of his troops were Milesians.

But the victorious career of Nekôs was completely checked by the defeat which he experienced at Carchemisch (or Circesium) on the Euphrates, from Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonians, who not only drove him out of Judæa and Syria but also took Jerusalem, and carried away the king and the principal Jews into captivity.² Nebuchadnezzar farther attacked the Phenician cities, and the siege of Tyre alone cost him severe toil for thirteen years. After this long and gallant resistance, the Tyrians were forced to submit, and underwent the same fate as the Jews. Their princes and chiefs were dragged captive into the Babylonian territory, and the Phenician cities became numbered among the tributaries of Nebuchadnezzar. So they seem to have remained, until the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus: for we find among those extracts (unhappily very brief) which Josephus has preserved out of the Tyrian annals, that during this interval there were disputes and irregularities in the government of Tyre³

Defeated by
Nebuchad-
nezzar at
Carchemisch.

¹ Herodot. ii. 159. Diodorus makes no mention of Nekôs.

The account of Herodotus coincides in the main with the history of the Old Testament about Pharaoh Necho and Josiah. The great city of Syria which he calls *Kάδυρις* seems to be Jerusalem, though Wesseling (ad Herodot. iii. 5) and other able critics dispute the identity. See Volney, Recherches sur l'Hist. Anc. vol. ii. ch. 13. p. 239: "Les Arabes ont conservé l'habitude d'appeler Jérusalem la Sainte par excellence, *el Qods*. Sans doute les Chaldéens et les Syriens lui donnèrent le même nom, qui dans leur dialecte est *Qadouta*, dont Hérodote rend bien l'or-

thographie quand il écrit *Kάδυρις*."

² Jeremiah, xlv. 2; 2nd book of Kings, xxiii. and xxiv.; Josephus, Ant. J. x. 5, 1; x. 6. 1.

About Nebuchadnezzar, see the Fragment of Berossus ap. Joseph. cont. Apion. i. 19, 20, and Antiqu. J. x. 11, 1, and Berosi Fragment. ed. Richter, p. 65-67.

³ Menander ap. Joseph. Antiqu. J. ix. 14, 2. 'Επὶ Εἰθωβάλου τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπολιόρκησε Ναβουχοδονόσορος τὴν Τύρον ἐπ' ἑτη δεκάτρια. That this siege of thirteen years ended in the storming, capitulation, or submission (we know not which, and Volney goes beyond the evidence when he says, "Les Tyriens

—judges being for a time substituted in the place of kings; while Merbal and Hirom, two princes of the regal Tyrian line, detained captive in Babylonia, were successively sent down on the special petition of the Tyrians, and reigned at Tyre; the former four years, the latter twenty years, until the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. The Egyptian king Apriês, indeed, son of Psammis and grandson of Nekôs, attacked Sidon and Tyre both by land and sea, but seemingly without any result.¹ To the Persian empire, as soon as Cyrus had conquered Babylon, they cheerfully and spontaneously submitted,² whereby the restoration of the captive Tyrians to their home was probably conceded to them, like that of the captive Jews.

Nekôs in Egypt was succeeded by his son Psammis, and he again, after a reign of six years, by his son Apriês; of ^{Psammis, son of Nekôs} Apriês, whose power and prosperity Herodotus speaks in very high general terms, though the few particulars which he recounts are of a contrary tenor. It was not till after a reign of twenty-five years that Apriês undertook that expedition against the Greek colonies in Libya—Kyrênê and Barka—which proved his ruin. The native Libyan tribes near those cities having sent to surrender themselves to him and entreat his aid against the Greek settlers, Apriês despatched to them a large force composed of native Egyptians; who (as has been before mentioned) were stationed on the north-western frontier of Egypt, and were therefore most available for the march against Kyrênê. The Kyrenean citizens advanced to oppose them, and a battle ensued in which the Egyptians were completely routed with severe loss. It is affirmed that they were thrown into disorder from want of practical knowledge

furent emportés d'assaut par le roi de Babylone," *Recherches sur l'Histoire Ancienne*, vol. ii. ch. 14. p. 250) of Tyre to the Chaldean king, is quite certain from the mention which afterwards follows of the Tyrian princes being detained captive in Babylonia. Hengstenberg (*De Rebus Tyriorum*, p. 34-77) heaps up a mass of arguments, most of them very inconclusive, to prove this point, about which the passage cited by Josephus from Menander leaves no doubt. What is *not* true, is, that Tyre was destroyed and laid desolate by Nebuchadnezzar: still less can it be believed that that king conquered Egypt and Libya, as Megasthenes, and even Berosus so far as Egypt is concerned, would have us believe—the argument of Larcher ad Herodot. ii. 168 is any-

thing but satisfactory. The defeat of the Egyptian king at Carchemisch, and the stripping him of his foreign possessions in Judæa and Syria, have been exaggerated into a conquest of Egypt itself.

¹ Herodot. ii. 161. He simply mentions what I have stated in the text; while Diodorus tells us (i. 68) that the Egyptian king took Sidon by assault, terrified the other Phœnician towns into submission, and defeated the Phœnicians and Cyprians in a great naval battle, acquiring a vast spoil.

What authority Diodorus here followed, I do not know; but the measured statement of Herodotus is far the most worthy of credit.

² Herodot. iii. 19.

of Grecian warfare¹—a remarkable proof of the entire isolation of the Grecian mercenaries (who had now been long in the service of Psammetichus and his successors) from the native Egyptians.

This disastrous reverse provoked a mutiny in Egypt against Apriês, the soldiers contending that he had despatched them on the enterprise with a deliberate view to their destruction, in order to assure his rule over the remaining Egyptians. The malcontents found so much sympathy among the general population, that Amasis, a Saitic Egyptian of low birth but of considerable intelligence, whom Apriês had sent to conciliate them, was either persuaded or constrained to become their leader, and prepared to march immediately against the king at Saïs. Unbounded and reverential submission to the royal authority was a habit so deeply rooted in the Egyptian mind, that Apriês could not believe the resistance to be serious. He sent an officer of consideration named Patarbêmis to bring Amasis before him. When Patarbêmis returned, bringing back from the rebel nothing better than a contemptuous refusal to appear except at the head of an army, the exasperated king ordered his nose and ears to be cut off. This act of atrocity caused such indignation among the Egyptians round him, that most of them deserted and joined the revolt, who thus became irresistibly formidable in point of numbers. There yet remained to Apriês the foreign mercenaries—thirty thousand Ionians and Karians—whom he summoned from their Stratopeda on the Pelusiatic Nile to his residence at Saïs. This force, the

Amasis—
dethrones
Apriês by
means of
the native
soldiers.

creation of his ancestor Psammetichus and the main reliance of his family, still inspired him with such unabated confidence, that he marched to attack the far superior numbers under Amasis at Momemphis. Though his troops behaved with bravery, the disparity of numbers, combined with the excited feeling of the insurgents, overpowered him: he was defeated and carried prisoner to Saïs, where at first Amasis not only spared his life, but treated him with generosity.² Such however was the antipathy of the Egyptians, that they forced Amasis to surrender his prisoner into their hands, and immediately strangled him.

It is not difficult to trace in these proceedings the outbreak of a long-suppressed hatred on the part of the Egyptian soldier-caste towards the dynasty of Psammetichus, to whom they owed their comparative degradation, and by whom that stream of Hellenism had been let in upon Egypt which doubtless was not witnessed

¹ Herodot. ii. 161; iv. 159.

² Herodot. ii. 162-169; Diodor. i. 68.

without great repugnance. It might seem also that this dynasty had too little of pure Egyptianism in them to find favour with the priests. At least Herodotus does not mention any religious edifices erected either by Nekôs or Psammis or Apriês, though he describes much of such outlay on the part of Psammetichus—who built magnificent Propylæa to the temple of Hephæstos at Memphis,¹ and a splendid new chamber or stable for the sacred bull Apis—and more still on the part of Amasis.

Nevertheless Amasis, though he had acquired the crown by this explosion of native antipathy, found the foreign adjuncts so eminently advantageous, that he not only countenanced, but multiplied them. Egypt enjoyed under him a degree of power and consideration such as it neither before possessed, nor afterwards retained—for his long reign of forty-four years (570–526 B.C.) closed just six months before the Persian conquest of the country. As he was eminently phil-Hellenic, the Greek merchants at Naukratis—the permanent settlers as well as the occasional visitors—obtained from him valuable enlargement of their privileges. Besides granting permission to various Grecian towns to erect religious establishments for such of their citizens as visited the place, he also sanctioned the constitution of a formal and organised emporium or factory, invested with commercial privileges, and armed with authority exercised by presiding officers regularly chosen. This factory was connected with, and probably grew out of, a large religious edifice and precinct, built at the joint cost of nine Grecian cities: four of them Ionic,—Chios, Teôs, Phôkæa, and Klazomenæ; four Doric,—Rhodes, Knidus, Halikarnassus, and Phasêlis; and one Æolic,—Mitylênê. By these nine cities the joint temple and factory was kept up and its presiding magistrates chosen. But its destination, for the convenience of Grecian commerce generally, seems revealed by the imposing title of *The Hellenion*. Samos, Milêtus, and Ægina had each founded a separate temple at Naukratis for the worship of such of their citizens as went there; probably connected (as the Hellenion was) with protection and facilities for commercial purposes. While these three powerful cities had thus constituted each a factory for itself, as guarantee to the merchandise, and as responsible for the conduct of its own citizens separately—the corporation of the Hellenion served both as protection and control to all other Greek merchants. And such was the usefulness, the celebrity, and probably the pecu-

He encourages Grecian commerce.

Important factory and religious establishment for the Greeks at Naukratis.

¹ Herodot. ii. 153.

niary profit, of the corporation, that other Grecian cities set up claims to a share in it, falsely pretending to have contributed to the original foundation.¹

Naukratis was for a long time the privileged port for Grecian commerce with Egypt. No Greek merchant was permitted to deliver goods in any other part, or to enter any other of the mouths of the Nile except the Kanôpic. If forced into any of them by stress of weather, he was compelled to make oath that his arrival was a matter of necessity, and to convey his goods round by sea into the Kanôpic branch to Naukratis. If the weather still forbade such a proceeding, the merchandise was put into barges and conveyed round to Naukratis by the internal canals of the Delta. Such a monopoly, which made Naukratis in Egypt something like Canton in China or Nangasaki in Japan, no longer subsisted in the time of Herodotus.² But the factory of the Hellênion was in full operation and dignity, and very probably he himself, as a native of one of the contributing cities, Halikarnassus, may have profited by its advantages. At what precise time Naukratis first became licensed for Grecian trade, we cannot directly make out. But there seems reason to believe that it was the port to which the Greek merchants first went, so soon as the general liberty of trading with the country was conceded to them; and this would put the date of such grant at least as far back as the foundation of Kyrênê and the voyage of the fortunate Kôlæus, who was on his way with a cargo to Egypt when the storms overtook him—about 630 B.C., during the reign of Psammetichus. And in the time of the poetess Sapphō and her brother Charaxus, it seems evident that Greeks had been some time established at Naukratis.³ But Amasis, though his predecessors had permitted

¹ Herodot. ii. 178. The few words of the historian about these Greek establishments at Naukratis are highly valuable, and we can only wish that he had told us more: he speaks of them in the present tense, from personal knowledge—τὸ μὲν νῦν μέγιστον αὐτῶν τέμενος καὶ οὐνομαστότατον ἔδν καὶ χρησιμώτατον, καλούμενον δὲ Ἑλλήνιον, αἶδε πόλις εἰσὶν αἱ παρέχουσαι—Τουτέων μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ τέμενος, καὶ προστατάς τοῦ ἐμπορίου αὐταὶ αἱ πόλις εἰσὶν αἱ παρέχουσαι. Ὅσαι δὲ ἄλλαι πόλις μεταποιοιῦνται, οὐδὲν σφὶ μετεῶν μεταποιοιῦνται.

We are here let into a vein of commercial jealousy between the Greek cities about which we should have been glad to be farther informed.

² Herodot. ii. 179. Ἦν δὲ τοπαλαῖδον μούνη ἡ Ναύκρατις ἐμπόριον, καὶ ἄλλο οὐδὲν Αἰγύπτου Οὕτω δὲ Ναύκρατις ἐτετίμητο.

³ The beautiful Thracian courtesan, Rhodôpis, was purchased by a Samian merchant named Xanthês, and conveyed to Naukratis, in order that he might make money by her (κατ' ἐργασίην). The speculation proved a successful one, for Charaxus, brother of Sappho, going to Naukratis with a cargo of wine, became so captivated with Rhodôpis, that he purchased her for a very large sum of money, and gave her her freedom. She then carried on her profession at Naukratis on her own account, and realised a handsome fortune, the tithe of which she employed

such establishment, may doubtless be regarded as having given organisation to the factories, and as having placed the Greeks on a more comfortable footing of security than they had ever enjoyed before.

This Egyptian king manifested several other evidences of his phil-Hellenic disposition by donations to Delphi and other Grecian temples. He even married a Grecian wife from the city of Kyrênê.¹ Moreover he was in intimate alliance and relations of hospitality both with Polykratês despot of Samos and with Crœsus king of Lydia.² He conquered the island of Cyprus, and rendered it tributary to the Egyptian throne. His fleet and army were maintained in good condition, and the foreign mercenaries, the great strength of the dynasty whom he had supplanted, were not only preserved, but even removed from their camp near Pelusium to the chief town Memphis, where they served as the special guards of Amasis.³ Egypt enjoyed under him a degree of power abroad and prosperity at home (the river having been abundant in its overflowing), which was the more tenaciously remembered on account of the period of disaster and subjugation immediately following his death. And his contributions, in architecture and sculpture, to the temples of Saïs⁴ and Memphis were on a scale of vastness surpassing everything before known in Lower Egypt.

in a votive offering at Delphi. She acquired so much renown, that the Egyptian Greeks ascribed to her the building of one of the pyramids,—a supposition on the absurdity of which Herodotus makes proper comments, but which proves the great celebrity of the name of Rhodôpis (Herodot. ii. 134). Athenæus calls her Dôrichê, and distinguishes her from Rhodôpis (xiii. p. 596, compare Suidas, v. 'Ροδωπίδος ἀνάθημα). When Charaxus returned to Mitylênê, his sister Sappho composed a song, in which she greatly derided him for this proceeding — a song which doubtless Herodotus knew, and which gives to the whole anecdote a complete authenticity.

Now we can hardly put the age of Sappho lower than 600–580 B.C. (see Mr. Clinton, Fasti Hellen. ad ann. 595

B.C., and Ulrici, Geschichte der Griech. Lyrik, ch. xxiii. p. 360): Alkæus, too, her contemporary, had himself visited Egypt (Alcæi Fragm. 103, ed. Bergk; Strabo, i. p. 63). The Greek settlement at Naukratis therefore must be decidedly older than Amasis, who began to reign in 570 B.C., and the residence of Rhodôpis in that town must have begun earlier than Amasis, though Herodotus calls her κατ' Ἀμασιν ἀκμάζουσα (ii. 134). We cannot construe the language of Herodotus strictly, when he says that it was Amasis who permitted the residence of Greeks at Naukratis (ii. 178).¹ Herodot. ii. 181.

² Herodot. i. 77; iii. 39.

³ Herodot. ii. 182, 154. κατοίκησε ἐς Μέμφιν, φυλακὴν ἐωῶτον ποιούμενος πρὸς Αἰγυπτίων.

⁴ Herodot. ii. 175–177.

CHAPTER XXI.

DECLINE OF THE PHENICIANS.—GROWTH OF CARTHAGE.

THE preceding sketch of that important system of foreign nations—Phenicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians—who occupied the south-eastern portion of the (οἰκουμένη) inhabited world of an early Greek, brings them down nearly to the time at which they were all absorbed into the mighty Persian empire. In tracing the series of events which intervened between 700 B.C. and 530 B.C., we observe a material increase of power both in the Chaldæans and Egyptians, and an immense extension of Grecian maritime activity and commerce—but we at the same time notice the decline of Tyre and Sidon, both in power and traffic. The arms of Nebuchadnezzar reduced the Phenician cities to the same state of dependence as that which the Ionian cities underwent half a century later from Cræsus and Cyrus; while the ships of Miletus, Phôkæa and Samos gradually spread over all those waters of the Levant which had once been exclusively Phenician. In the year 704 B.C., the Samians did not yet possess a single trireme:¹ down to the year 630 B.C., not a single Greek vessel had yet visited Libya. But when we reach 550 B.C., we find the Ionic ships predominant in the Ægean, and those of Corinth and Korkyra in force to the west of Peloponnesus—we see the flourishing cities of Kyrênê and Barka already rooted in Libya, and the port of Naukratis a busy emporium of Grecian commerce with Egypt. The trade by land—which is all that Egypt had enjoyed prior to Psammetichus, and which was exclusively conducted by Phenicians—is exchanged for a trade by sea, of which the Phenicians have only a share, and seemingly a smaller share than the Greeks. Moreover the conquest by Amasis of the island of Cyprus, half-filled with Phenician settlements and once the tributary dependency of Tyre—affords an additional mark of the comparative decline of that great city. In her commerce with the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf she still remained without a competitor, the schemes

Between
700-530 B.C.
Decline of
the Phenicians—
growth of
Grecian maritime
and commerce.

¹ Thucyd. i. 13.

of the Egyptian king Nekôs having proved abortive. Even in the time of Herodotus, the spices and frankincense of Arabia were still brought and distributed only by the Phenician merchant.¹ But on the whole, both political and industrial development of Tyre are now cramped by impediments, and kept down by rivals, not before in operation; so that the part which she will be found to play in the Mediterranean, throughout the whole course of this history, is one subordinate and of reduced importance.

The course of Grecian history is not directly affected by these countries. Yet their effect upon the Greek mind was very considerable, and the opening of the Nile by Psammetichus constitutes an epoch in Hellenic thought. It supplied to their observation a large and diversified field of present reality, while it was at the same time one great source of those mysticising tendencies which corrupted so many of their speculative minds. But to Phenicia and Assyria, the Greeks owe two acquisitions well-deserving special mention—the alphabet, and the first standard and scale of weight as well as coined money. Of neither of these acquisitions can we trace the precise date. That the Greek alphabet is derived from the Phenician, the analogy of the two proves beyond dispute, though we know not how or where the inestimable present was handed over, of which no traces are to be found in the Homeric poems.² The Latin alphabet, which is nearly identical with the most ancient Doric variety of the Greek, was derived from the same source—also the Etruscan alphabet, though (if O. Müller is

Effect of Phenicians, Assyrians, and Egyptians on the Greek mind. The alphabet.—The scale of money and weight.

¹ Herodot. iii. 107.

² The various statements or conjectures to be found in Greek authors (all comparatively recent) respecting the origin of the Greek alphabet, are collected by Franz, *Epigraphicæ Græcæ*, s. iii. pp. 12–20: “Omnino Græci alphabeti ut certa primordia sunt in origine Phœniciâ, ita certus terminus in litteraturâ Ionicâ seu Simonideâ. Quæ inter utrumque a veteribus ponuntur, incerta omnia et fabulosa . . . Non commemoramur in iis quæ de litterarum origine et propagatione ex fabulosâ Pelasgorum historiâ (cf. Knight, p. 119–123; Raoul Rochette, p. 67–87) neque in iis quæ de Cadmo narrantur, quem unquam fuisse hodie jam nemo crediderit . . . Alphabeti Phœnicii omnes 22 litteras cum antiquis Græcis congruere, hodie nemo est qui ignoret.” (p. 14, 15.) Franz gives valuable information respecting the changes gradually intro-

duced into the Greek alphabet, and the erroneous statements of the Grammatici as to what letters were original, and what were subsequently added.

Kruse also in his ‘Hellas’ (vol. i. p. 13, and in the first Beilage, annexed to that volume) presents an instructive comparison of the Greek, Latin, and Phenician alphabets.

The Greek authors, as might be expected, were generally much more fond of referring the origin of letters to native heroes or gods, such as Palamedês, Promêtheus, Musæus, Orpheus, Linus, &c., than to the Phenicians. The oldest known statement (that of Stésichorus, Schol. ap. Bekker. Anecd. ii. p. 786) ascribes them to Palamedês.

Both Franz and Kruse contend strenuously for the existence and habit of writing among the Greeks in times long anterior to Homer; in which I dissent from them.

correct in his conjecture) only at second-hand through the intervention of the Greek.¹ If we cannot make out at what time the Phenicians made this valuable communication to the Greeks, much less can we determine when or how they acquired it themselves—whether it be of Semitic invention, or derived from improvement upon the phonetic hieroglyphics of the Egyptians.²

Besides the letters of the alphabet, the scale of weight and that of coined money passed from Phenicia and Assyria into Greece. It has been shown by Boeckh in his 'Metrologie' that the Æginæan scale³—with its divisions, talent, mna, and obolus—is identical with the Babylonian and Phenician; and that the word *Mna*, which forms the central point of the scale, is of Chaldæan origin. On this I have already touched in a former chapter, while relating the history of Pheidôn of Argos, by whom what is called the Æginæan scale was first promulgated.

In tracing therefore the effect upon the Greek mind, of early intercourse with the various Asiatic nations, we find that as the Greeks made up their musical scale (so important an element of their early mental culture) in part by borrowing from Lydians and Phrygians—so also their monetary and statal system, their alphabetical writing, and their duodecimal division of the day measured by the gnomon and the shadow, were all derived from Assyrians and Phenicians. The early industry and commerce of these countries were thus in many ways available to Grecian advance, and would probably have become more so if the great and rapid rise of the more barbarous Persians had not reduced them all to servitude. The Phenicians, though unkind rivals, were at the same time examples and stimulants to Greek maritime aspiration; and the Phenician worship of that goddess whom the Greeks knew under the name of Aphroditê, became communicated to the latter in Cyprus, in Kythêra, in Sicily—perhaps also in Corinth.

The sixth century B.C., though a period of decline for Tyre and Sidon, was a period of growth for their African colony Carthage. Carthage, which appears during this century in considerable traffic with the Tyrrhenian towns on the southern coast of Italy, and as thrusting out the Phôkæan settlers from Alalia in Corsica. The wars of the Carthaginians with the Grecian colonies

¹ See O. Müller, *Die Etrusker* (iv. 6), where there is much instruction on the Tuscan alphabet.

² This question is raised and discussed by Justus Olshausen, *Ueber den*

Ursprung des Alphabetes (p. 1-10), in the *Kieler Philologische Studien*, 1841.

³ See Boeckh, *Metrologie*, ch. iv. v. vi.; also the preceding volume of this History.

in Sicily, so far as they are known to us, commence shortly after 500 B.C., and continue at intervals, with fluctuating success, for two centuries and a half.

The foundation of Carthage by the Tyrians is placed at different dates, the lowest of which however is 819 B.C.: other authorities place it in 878 B.C., and we have no means of ^{Era of Carthage.} deciding between them. I have already remarked that it is by no means the oldest of the Tyrian colonies. But though Utica and Gadès were more ancient than Carthage,¹ the latter so greatly outstripped them in wealth and power, as to acquire a sort of federal pre-eminence over all the Phenician colonies on the coast of Africa. In those later times when the dominion of ^{Dominion of Carthage.} the Carthaginians had reached its maximum, it comprised the towns of Utica, Hippo, Adrumêtum, and Leptis,—all original Phenician foundations, and enjoying probably even as dependents of Carthage, a certain qualified autonomy—besides a great number of smaller towns planted by themselves, and inhabited by a mixed population called Liby-Phenicians. Three hundred such towns—a dependent territory covering half the space between the Lesser and the Greater Syrtis, and in many parts remarkably fertile—a city said to contain 700,000 inhabitants, active, wealthy, and seemingly homogeneous—and foreign dependencies in Sicily, Sardinia, the Balearic isles, and Spain,—all this aggregate of power, under one political management, was sufficient to render the contest of Carthage even with Rome for some time doubtful.

But by what steps the Carthaginians raised themselves to such a pitch of greatness we have no information. We are even left to guess how much of it had already been acquired in the sixth century B.C. As in the case of so many other cities, we have a foundation legend decorating the moment of birth, and then nothing

¹ Utica is said to have been founded 287 years earlier than Carthage; the author, who states this, professing to draw his information from Phenician histories (Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 134). Velleius Paternulus states Gadès to be older than Utica, and places the foundation of Carthage B.C. 819 (i. 2, 6). He seems to follow in the main the same authority as the composer of the Aristotelic compilation above-cited. Other statements place the foundation of Carthage in 878 B.C. (Heeren, Ideen über den Verkehr, &c., part ii. b. i. p. 29). Appian states the date of the foundation as fifty years before the Trojan war (De Reb. Punic. c. 1);

Philistus as twenty-one years before the same event (Philist. Fragm. 50, ed. Göller); Timeus, as thirty-eight years earlier than the first Olympiad (Timæi Fragm. 21, ed. Didot); Justin, seventy-two years earlier than the foundation of Rome (xviii. 6).

The citation which Josephus gives from Menander's work, extracted from Tyrian *ἀναγραφαι*, placed the foundation of Carthage 143 years after the building of the temple of Jerusalem (Joseph. cont. Apion. i. c. 17, 18). Apion said that Carthage was founded in the first year of Olympiad 7 (B.C. 748) (Joseph. c. Apion. ii. 2).

farther. The Tyrian princess Dido or Elisa, daughter of Belus, sister of Pygmalion king of Tyre, and wife of the
Dido.
wealthy Sichæus priest of Hêraklês in that city—is said to have been left a widow in consequence of the murder of Sichæus by Pygmalion, who seized the treasures belonging to his victim. But Dido found means to disappoint him of his booty, possessed herself of the gold which had tempted Pygmalion, and secretly emigrated, carrying with her the sacred insignia of Hêraklês. A considerable body of Tyrians followed her. She settled at Carthage on a small hilly peninsula joined by a narrow tongue of land to the continent, purchasing from the natives as much land as could be surrounded by an ox's hide, which she caused to be cut into the thinnest strip, and thus made it sufficient for the site of her first citadel, Byrsa, which afterwards grew up into the great city of Carthage. As soon as her new settlement had acquired footing, she was solicited in marriage by several princes of the native tribes, especially by the Gætulian Jarbas, who threatened war if he were refused. Thus pressed by the clamours of her own people, who desired to come into alliance with the natives, yet irrevocably determined to maintain exclusive fidelity to her first husband, she escaped the conflict by putting an end to her life. She pretended to acquiesce in the proposition of a second marriage, requiring only delay sufficient to offer an expiatory sacrifice to the manes of Sichæus. A vast funeral pile was erected, and many victims slain upon it, in the midst of which Dido pierced her own bosom with a sword and perished in the flames. Such is the legend to which Virgil has given a new colour by interweaving the adventures of Æneas, and thus connecting the foundation legends of Carthage and Rome, careless of his deviation from the received mythical chronology. Dido was worshipped as a goddess at Carthage until the destruction of the city:¹ and it has been imagined with some probability that she is identical with Astartê, the divine patroness under whose auspices the colony was originally established, as Gadês and Tarsus were founded under those of Hêraklês—the tale of the funeral pile and self-burning appearing in the religious ceremonies of other Cilician and Syrian

¹ "Quamdiu Carthago invicta fuit, pro Deâ culta est." (Justin. xviii. 6; Virgil, *Æneid*, i. 340–370.) We trace this legend about Dido up to Timæus (Timæi Frag. 23, ed. Didot): Philistus seems to have followed a different story—he said that Carthage had been founded by Azor and Karchêdôn (Philist. Fr. 50).

Appian notices both stories (*De Reb. Pun.* 1): that of Dido was current both among the Romans and Carthaginians: of Zôrus (or Ezôrus) and Karchêdôn, the second is evidently of Greek coinage, the first seems genuine Phenician: see Josephus *cont. Apion.* i. c. 18–21.

towns.¹ Phenician religion and worship was diffused along with the Phenician colonies throughout the larger portion of the Mediterranean.

The Phôkæans of Ionia, who amidst their adventurous voyages westward established the colony of Massalia (as early as 600 B.C.), were only enabled to accomplish this by a naval victory over the Carthaginians—the earliest example of Greek and Carthaginian collision which has been preserved to us. The Carthaginians were jealous of commercial rivalry, and their traffic with the Tuscans and Latins in Italy, as well as their lucrative mine-working in Spain, dates from a period when Greek commerce in those regions was hardly known. In Greek authors the denomination Phenicians is often used to designate the Carthaginians as well as the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, so that we cannot always distinguish which of the two is meant. But it is remarkable that the distant establishment of Gadês, and the numerous settlements planted for commercial purposes along the western coast of Africa and without the Strait of Gibraltar, are expressly ascribed to the Tyrians.² Many of the other Phenician establishments on the southern coast of Spain seem to have owed their origin to Carthage rather than to Tyre. But the relations between the two, so far as we know them, were constantly amicable, and Carthage even at the period of her highest glory sent Theôri with a tribute of religious recognition to the Tyrian Hêrakilês: the visit of these envoys coincided with the siege of the town by Alexander the Great. On that critical occasion, the wives and children of the Tyrians were sent to find shelter at Carthage. Two centuries before, when the Persian empire was in its age of growth and expansion, the Tyrians had refused to aid Kambysês with their fleet in its plans for conquering Carthage, and thus probably preserved their colony from subjugation.³

¹ See Mövers, *Die Phonizier*, pp. 609-616.

² Strabo, xvii. p. 826.

³ Herodot. iii. 19.

CHAPTER XXII.

WESTERN COLONIES OF GREECE—IN EPIRUS, ITALY, SICILY,
AND GAUL.

THE stream of Grecian colonisation to the westward, as far as we can be said to know it authentically, with names and dates, begins from the 11th Olympiad. But it is reasonable to believe that there were other attempts earlier than this, though we must content ourselves with recognising them as generally probable. There were doubtless detached bands of volunteer emigrants or marauders, who, fixing themselves in some situation favourable to commerce or piracy, either became mingled with the native tribes, or grew up by successive reinforcements into an acknowledged town. Not being able to boast of any filiation from the Prytaneium of a known Grecian city, these adventurers were often disposed to fasten upon the inexhaustible legend of the Trojan war, and ascribe their origin to one of the victorious heroes in the host of Agamemnon, alike distinguished for their valour and for their ubiquitous dispersion after the siege. Of such alleged settlements by fugitive Grecian or Trojan heroes, there were a great number, on various points throughout the shores of the Mediterranean; and the same honourable origin was claimed even by many non-Hellenic towns.

In the eighth century B.C., when this westerly stream of Grecian colonisation begins to assume an authentic shape (735 B.C.), the population of Sicily (as far as our scanty information permits us to determine it) consisted of two races completely distinct from each other—Sikels and Sikans—besides the Elymi (a mixed race apparently distinct from both, occupying Eryx and Eggesta near the westernmost corner of the island) and the Phenician colonies and coast establishments formed for purposes of trade. According to the belief both of Thucydidēs and Philistus, these Sikans, though they gave themselves out as indigenous, were yet of Iberian origin¹ and

¹ Thucyd. vi. 2; Philistus, *Fragm.* 3, ed. Göller, ap. Diodor. v. 6. Timæus adopted the opposite opinion (Diodor. l. c.), also Ephorus, if we may judge by an indistinct passage of Strabo (vi. p. 270). Dionysius of Halikarnassus fol-

lows Thucydidēs (A. R. i. 22).

The opinion of Philistus is of much value on this point, since he was, or might have been, personally cognizant of Iberian mercenaries in the service of the elder Dionysius.

immigrants of earlier date than the Sikels—by whom they had been invaded and restricted to the smaller western half of the island. The Sikels were said to have crossed over originally from the south-western corner of the Calabrian peninsula, where a portion of the nation still dwelt in the time of Thucydides. The territory known to Greek writers of the fifth century B.C. by the names of *Enotria* on the coast of the Mediterranean, and *Italia* Enotria—
Italia. on that of the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace, included all that lies south of a line drawn across the breadth of the country, from the Gulf of Poseidônia (Pæstum) and the river Silarus on the Mediterranean Sea, to the north-west corner of the Gulf of Tarentum. It was bounded northwards by the Iapygians and Messapians, who occupied the Salentine peninsula and the country immediately adjoining to Tarentum, and by the Peuketians on the Ionic Gulf. According to the logographers Pherekydês and Hellanikus,¹ *Enotrus* and *Peuketius* were sons of *Lykaôn*, grandsons of *Pelagus*, and emigrants in very early times from *Arcadia* to this territory. An important statement in *Stephanus Byzantinus*² acquaints us that the serf-population, whom the great Hellenic cities in this portion of Italy employed in the cultivation of their lands, were called *Pelasci*, seemingly even in the historical times. *Pelasci in
Italy.* It is upon this name probably that the mythical genealogy of *Pherekydês* is constructed. This *Enotrian* or *Pelasgian* race were the population whom the Greek colonists found there on their arrival. They were known apparently under other names, such as the *Sikels* (mentioned even in the *Odyssey*, though their exact locality in that poem cannot be ascertained), the *Italians* or *Itali*, properly so called—the *Morgêtes*—and the *Chaones*—all of them names of tribes either cognate or subdivisional.³ The *Chaones* or *Chaonians* are also found not only in Italy, but in *Epirus*, as one of the most considerable of the *Epirotic* tribes; while *Pandosia*, the ancient residence of the *Enotrian* kings in the southern corner of Italy,⁴ was also the name of a township or locality in *Epirus*, with a neighbouring river *Acheron* in both. From hence, and from some other similarities of name, it has been imagined that *Epirots*, *Enotrians*, *Sikels*, &c. were all names of cognate people, and all entitled to be comprehended under the generic appellation of *Pelasci*. That they belonged to the same ethnical

¹ Pherekyd. Fragm. 85, ed. Didot; Hellanik. Fr. 53, ed. Didot; Dionys. Halik. A. R. i. 11, 13, 22; Skymnus Chius. v. 362; Pausan. viii. 3, 5.

² Stephan. Byz. v. *Χῆλοι*.

³ Aristot. Polit. vii. 9, 3. "Ὀκουν δὲ τὸ πρὸς τὴν Ἰαπυγίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰόνιον

Χῶνες (or *Χάωνες*) τὴν καλουμένην Σίριν ἦσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ Χῶνες Οἰνωτροὶ τὸ γένος.

Antiochus Fr. 3, 4, 6, 7, ed. Didot; Strabo, vi. p. 254; Hesych. v. *Χῶνες*; Dionys. Hal. A. R. i. 12.

⁴ Livy, viii. 24.

kindred, there seems fair reason to presume; and also that in point of language, manners, and character, they were not very widely separated from the ruder branches of the Hellenic race.

It would appear too (as far as any judgement can be formed on a point essentially obscure) that the Ænотrians were ethnically akin to the primitive population of Rome and Latium on one side,¹ as they were to the Epirots on the other; and that tribes of this race, comprising Sikels, and Itali properly so called, as sections, had at one time occupied most of the territory from the left bank of the river Tiber southward between the Apennines and the Mediterranean. Both Herodotus, and his junior contemporary the Syracusan Antiochus, extend Ænотria as far northward as the river Silarus,² and Sophoklēs includes the whole coast of the Mediterranean, from the Strait of Messina to the Gulf of Genoa, under the three successive names of Ænотria, the Tyrrhenian Gulf, and Liguria.³ Before or during

Latins—
Ænотrians
—Epirots
—ethnically
cognate.

¹ For the early habitation of Sikels or Siculi in Latium and Campania, see Dionys. Hal. A. R. i. 1–21: it is curious that Siculi and Sicani, whether the same or different, the primitive ante-Hellenic population of Sicily, are also numbered as the ante-Roman population of Rome: see Virgil, *Æneid*, viii. 328, and Servius ad *Æneid*. xi. 317.

The alleged ancient emigration of Evander from Arcadia to Latium forms a parallel to the emigration of Ænотrus from Arcadia to Southern Italy as recounted by Pherekydēs: it seems to have been mentioned even as early as in one of the Hesiodic poems (Servius ad Virg. *Æn*. viii. 138): compare Steph. Byz. v. Παλλάντιον. The earliest Latin authors appear all to have recognised Evander and his Arcadian emigrants: see Dionys. Hal. i. 31, 32, ii. 9, with his references to Fabius Pictor and Ælius Tubero, i. 79, 80; also Cato ap. Solinum, c. 2. If the old reading *Ἀρκάδων*, in Thucyd. vi. 2 (which Bekker has now altered into *Σικελῶν*), be retained, Thucydides would also stand as witness for a migration from Arcadia into Italy. A third emigration of Pelasgi, from Peloponnesus to the river Sarnus in Southern Italy (near Pompeii), was mentioned by Conon (ap. Servium ap. Virg. *Æn*. vii. 730).

² Herodotus (i. 24–167) includes Elea (or Velia) in Ænотria—and Tarentum in Italia; while Antiochus considers Tarentum as in Iapygia, and the southern boundary of the Tarentine territory as the northern boundary of Italia: Dionysius of Halikarnassus (Ar. ii. 1)

seems to copy from Antiochus when he extends the Ænотrians along the whole south-western corner of Italy, within the line drawn from Tarentum to Poseidonia or Pæstum. Hence the appellation *Οἰνωπρίδες νῆσοι* to the two islands opposite Elea (Strabo, vi. p. 253). Skymnus Chius (v. 247) recognises the same boundaries.

Twelve Ænотrian cities are cited by name (in Stephanus Byzantinus) from the *Εὐρώπη*-of Hekataeus (Fragm. 30–39, ed. Didot): Skylax in his *Periplus* does not name Ænотrians; he enumerates Campanians, Samnites, and Lucanians (cap. 9–13). The intimate connexion between Milētus and Sybaris would enable Hekataeus to inform himself about the interior Ænотrian country.

Ænотria and Italia together (as conceived by Antiochus and Herodotus) comprised what was known a century afterwards as Lucania and Bruttium: see Mannert, *Geographie der Griech. und Römer*, part ix. b. 9. ch. i. p. 86. Livy, speaking with reference to 317 B.C., when the Lucanian nation as well as the Bruttians were in full vigour, describes only the sea-coast of the lower sea as Grecian—"cum omni orā Græcorum inferi maris a Thuriis Neapolim et Cumas" (ix. 19). Verrius Flaccus considered the Sikels as *Græci* (Festus, v. Major Græcia, with Müller's note).

³ Sophoklēs, Triptolem. Fr. 527. ed. Dindorf. He places the lake Avernus, which was close to the Campanian Cumæ, in Tyrrhenia; see *Lexicon Sophocleum*, ad calc. ed. Brunck, v.

the fifth century B.C., however, a different population, called Opicians, Oscans, or Ausonians, had descended from their original seats on or north of the Apennines,¹ and had conquered the territory between Latium and the Silarus, expelling or subjugating the Ænotrian inhabitants, and planting outlying settlements even down to the Strait of Messina and the Liparæan isles. Hence the more precise Thucydides designates the Campanian territory, in which Cumæ stood, as the country of the Opici; a denomination which Aristotle extends to the river Tiber, so as to comprehend within it Rome and Latium.² Not merely Campania, but in earlier times even Latium, originally occupied by a Sikel or Ænotrian population, appears to have been partially overrun and subdued by fiercer tribes from the Apennines, and had thus received a certain intermixture of Oscan race. But in the regions south of Latium, these Oscan conquests were still more overwhelming; and to this cause (in the belief of inquiring Greeks of the fifth century B.C.)³ were owing the first migrations of the Ænotrian race out of

¹ *Ἀοργος*. Euripides (*Medea*, 1310–1326) seems to extend Tyrrhenia to the Strait of Messina.

² Aristotle. *Polit.* vii. 9, 3. *ἔκουν δὲ τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Τυρρηνίαν Ὀπικοί, καὶ πρότερον καὶ νῦν καλούμενοι τὴν ἐπὶ κλησὶν Αἰσόνες*. Festus: "*Ausoniam appellavit Auson, Ulysses et Calypsus filius, eam primam partem Italiae in qua sunt urbes Beneventum et Cales: deinde paulatim tota quoque Italia quae Apennino finitur, dicta est Ausonia*," &c. The original Ausonia would thus coincide nearly with the territory called Samnium, after the Sabine emigrants had conquered it: see Livy, viii. 16; Strabo, v. p. 250; Virg. *Æn.* vii. 727, with Servius. Skymnus Chius (v. 227) has copied from the same source as Festus. For the extension of Ausonians along various parts of the more southern coast of Italy, even to Rhegium as well as to the Liparæan isles, see Diodor. v. 7, 8; Cato, *Orig.* Fr. lib. iii. ap. *Probum* ad Virg. *Bucol.* v. 2. The Pythian priestess, in directing the Chalkidic emigrants to Rhegium, says to them—*Ἐνθα πόλιν οἰκίσεις, διδοὶ δέ σοι Αἰσώνα χώραν* (Diodor. *Fragm.* xiii. p. 11, ap. *Scriptt.* Vatic. ed. Maii). Temesa is Ausonian in Strabo, vi. p. 255.

³ Thucyd. vi. 3; Aristotle. ap. Dionys. Hal. A. R. i. 72. *Ἀρχαίων τινος τῶν ἀπὸ Τροίης ἀνακομιζομένων—ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς Ὀπικῆς, ὃς καλεῖται Λάτιον*.

Even in the time of Cato the elder, the Greeks comprehended the Romans under the general, and with them contemptuous, designation of Opici (Cato ap. Plin. H. N. xxii. 1: see Antiochus ap. Strab. v. p. 242).

⁴ Thucyd. vi. 2. *Σικελοὶ δὲ ἐξ Ἰταλίας φεύγοντες Ὀπικοὺς διέβησαν ἐς Σικελίαν* (see a Fragment of the geographer Menippus of Pergamus, in Hudson's *Geogr. Minor.* i. p. 76). Antiochus stated that the Sikels were driven out of Italy into Sicily by the Opicians and Ænotrians; but the Sikels themselves, according to him, were also Ænotrians (Dionys. H. i. 12–22). It is remarkable that Antiochus (who wrote at a time when the name of Rome had not begun to exercise that fascination over men's minds which the Roman power afterwards occasioned), in setting forth the mythical antiquity of the Sikels and Ænotrians, represents the eponymous Sikelus as an exile from Rome, who came into the south of Italy to the king Morgês, successor of Italus—*Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ἰταλος κατεγήρα, Μόργης ἐβασίλευσεν. Ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ ἀνὴρ ἀφίκετο ἐκ Ῥώμης φυγὰς, Σικελὺς ὄνομα αὐτῷ* (Antiochus ap. Dionys. H. i. 73: compare c. 12).

Philistus considered Sikelus to be a son of Italus: both he and Hellanikus believed in early migrations from Italy into Sicily, but described the emigrants differently (Philistus, *Fragm.* 2, ed. Didot).

Southern Italy, which wrested the larger portion of Sicily from the pre-existing Sikanians.

This imperfect account, representing the ideas of Greeks of the fifth century B.C. as to the early population of Southern Italy, is borne out by the fullest comparison which can be made between the Greek, Latin, and Oscan language—the first two certainly, and the third probably, sisters of the same Indo-European family of languages. While the analogy, structural and radical, between Greek and Latin, establishes completely such community of family—and while comparative philology proves that on many points the Latin departs less from the supposed common type and mother-language than the Greek—there exists also in the former a non-Grecian element, and non-Grecian classes of words, which appear to imply a confluence of two or more different people with distinct tongues. The same non-Grecian element, thus traceable in the Latin, seems to present itself still more largely developed in the scanty remains of the Oscan.¹ Moreover the

¹ See the learned observations upon the early languages of Italy and Sicily, which Müller has prefixed to his work on the Etruscans (Einleitung, i. 12). I transcribe the following summary of his views respecting the early Italian dialects and races:—“The notions which we thus obtain respecting the early languages of Italy are as follows: the *Sikel*, a sister language nearly allied to the Greek or Pelagic; the *Latin*, compounded from the *Sikel* and from the rougher dialect of the men called *Aborigines*; the *Oscan*, akin to the Latin in both its two elements; the language spoken by the Sabine emigrants in their various conquered territories, *Oscan*; the *Sabine proper*, a distinct and peculiar language, yet nearly connected with the non-Grecian element in Latin and Oscan, as well as with the language of the oldest Ausonians and *Aborigines*.”

[N.B. This last statement respecting the original Sabine language, is very imperfectly made out; it seems equally probable that the Sabellians may have differed from the Oscans no more than the Dorians from the Ionians: see Niebuhr, *Röm. Gesch.* tom. i. p. 69.]

“Such a comparison of languages presents to us a certain view, which I shall here briefly unfold, of the earliest history of the Italian races. At a period anterior to all records, a single people, akin to the Greeks, dwelling extended from the south of Tuscany down to the

Straits of Messina, occupies in the upper part of its territory only the valley of the Tiber—lower down, occupies the mountainous districts also, and in the south, stretches across from sea to sea—called *Sikels*, *Enotrians*, or *Peucetians*. Other mountain tribes, powerful though not widely extended, live in the northern Abruzzo and its neighbourhood: in the east the *Sabines*, southward from them the cognate *Marsi*, more to the west the *Aborigines*, and among them probably the old *Ausonians* or *Oscans*. About 1000 years prior to the Christian era, there arises among these tribes (from whom almost all the popular migrations in ancient Italy have proceeded) a movement whereby the *Aborigines* more northward, the *Sikels* more southward, are precipitated upon the *Sikels* of the plains beneath. Many thousands of the great *Sikel* nation withdraw to their brethren the *Enotrians*, and by degrees still farther across the Strait to the Island of Sicily. Others of them remain stationary in their residences, and form, in conjunction with the *Aborigines*, the *Latin* nation—in conjunction with the *Ausonians*, the *Oscan* nation: the latter extends itself over what was afterwards called *Samnium* and *Campania*. Still the population and power of these mountain tribes, especially that of the *Sabines*, goes on perpetually on the increase: as they pressed onward towards the Tiber, at the period when

Greek colonies in Italy and Sicily caught several peculiar words from their association with the Sikels, which words approach in most cases very nearly to the Latin—so that a resemblance thus appears between the language of Latium on the one side, and that of Ænotrians and Sikels (in Southern Italy and Sicily) on the other, prior to the establishments of the Greeks. These are the two extremities of the Sikel population; between them appear in the intermediate country the Oscan or Ausonian tribes and language; and these latter seem to have been in a great measure conquerors and intruders from the central mountains. Such analogies of language countenance the supposition of Thucydides and Antiochus, that these Sikels had once been spread over a still larger portion of Southern Italy, and had migrated from thence into Sicily in consequence of Oscan invasions. The element of affinity existing between Latins, Ænotrians and Sikels—to a certain degree also between all of them together and the Greeks, but not extending to the Opicians or Oscans, or to the Iapygians—may be called Pelasgic for want of a better name. But by whatever name it be called, the recognition of its existence connects and explains many isolated circumstances in the early history of Rome as well as in that of the Italian and Sicilian Greeks.

The earliest Grecian colony in Italy or Sicily, of which we know the precise date, is placed about 735 B.C., eighteen years subsequent to the Varronian æra of Rome; so that the causes, tending to subject and hellenise the Sikel population in the southern region, begin their operation nearly at the same time as those which tended gradually to exalt and aggrandise the modified variety of it which existed in Latium. At that time, according to the information given to Thucydides, the Sikels had been established for three centuries in Sicily. Hellanikus and Philistus—who both recognised a similar migration into that island out of Italy, though they give different names both to the emigrants and to those who expelled them—assign to the migration a date three generations before the Trojan war.¹ Earlier than 735 B.C., however, though we do not know the precise æra of its commencement, there existed one solitary Grecian establishment in the Tyrrhenian Sea—the Campanian Cumæ near Cape Mi-

Rome was only a single town, so they also advanced southwards, and conquered—first, the mountainous Opica; next, some centuries later, the Opician plain, Campania; lastly, the ancient country of the Ænotrians, afterwards denominated Lucania."

Compare Niebuhr, *Römisch. Geschichte*. vol. i. p. 80, 2nd edit., and the first chapter of Mr. Donaldson's *Varronianus*.

¹ Thucyd. vi. 2; Philistus, *Frag.* 2, ed. Didot.

Grecian colonisation of ascertained date in Sicily—commences in 735 B.C.

senum; which the more common opinion of chronologists supposed to have been founded in 1050 B.C., and which has even been carried back by some authors to 1139 B.C.¹ Without reposing any faith in this early chronology, we may at least feel certain that it is the most ancient Grecian establishment in any part of Italy, and that a considerable time elapsed before any other Greek colonists were bold enough to cut themselves off from the Hellenic world by occupying seats on the other side of the Strait of Messina,² with all the hazards of Tyrrhenian piracy as well as of Scylla and Charybdis. The Campanian Cumæ (known almost entirely by this its Latin designation) received its name and a portion of its inhabitants from the Æolic Kymê in Asia Minor. A joint band of settlers, partly from this latter town, partly from Chalkis in Eubœa—the former under the Kymæan Hippoklês, the latter under the Chalkidian Megasthenês—having combined to form the new town, it was settled by agreement that Kymê should bestow the name, and that Chalkis should enjoy the title and honours of the mother-city.³

Cumæ, situated on the neck of the peninsula, which terminates in Cape Misenum, occupied a lofty and rocky hill overhanging the sea,⁴ and difficult of access on the land side. The unexampled fertility of the Phlegræan plains in the immediate vicinity of the city, the copious supply of fish in the Lucrine lake,⁵ and the gold-mines in the neighbouring island of Pithekusæ—both subsisted and enriched the colonists. Being joined by fresh settlers from Chalkis, from Eretria, and even from Samos, they became numerous enough to form distinct towns at Dikæarchia and Neapolis, thus spreading over a large portion of the Bay of Naples. In the hollow rock under the very walls of the town was situated the cavern of the prophetic Sibyl—a parallel and reproduction of the Gergithian Sibyl near Kymê in Æolis. In the immediate neighbourhood, too,

¹ Strabo, v. p. 243; Velleius Patercul. i. 5; Eusebius, p. 121. M. Raoul Rochette, assuming a different computation of the date of the Trojan war, pushes the date of Cumæ still farther back to 1139 B.C. (Histoire des Colonies Grecques, book iv. c. 12. p. 100).

The mythes of Cumæ extended to a period preceding the Chalkidic settlement. See the stories of Aristæus and Dædalus ap. Sallust. Fragment. Incert. p. 204, ed. Delphin.; and Servius ad Virgil. Æneid. vi. 17. The fabulous Thespiadæ, or primitive Greek settlers in Sardinia, were supposed in early ages to have left that island and retired to

Cumæ (Diodor. v. 15).

² Ephorus, Frag. 52, ed. Didot.

³ Strabo, v. p. 243; Velleius Paterc. i. 5.

⁴ See the site of Cumæ as described by Agathias (on occasion of the siege of the place by Narses, in 552 A.D.), Histor. i. 8–10; also by Strabo, v. p. 244.

⁵ Diodor. iv. 21, v. 71; Polyb. iii. 91; Pliny, H. N. iii. 5; Livy, viii. 22. "In Baiano sinu Campaniæ contra Puteolanam civitatem lacus sunt duo, Avernus et Lucrinus: qui olim propter piscium copiam vectigalia magna præstabant" (Servius ad Virg. Georgic. ii. 161).

stood the wild woods and dark lake of Avernus, consecrated to the subterranean gods and offering an establishment of priests, with ceremonies evoking the dead for purposes of prophecy or for solving doubts and mysteries. It was here that Grecian imagination localised the Cimmerians and the fable of Odysseus; and the Cumæans derived gains from the numerous visitors to this holy spot,¹ perhaps hardly less than those of the inhabitants of Krissa from the vicinity of Delphi. Of the relations of these Cumæans with the Hellenic world generally, we unfortunately know nothing. But they seem to have been in intimate connexion with Rome during the time of the Kings, and especially during that of the last king Tarquin;² forming the intermediate link between the Greek and Latin world, whereby the feelings of the Teukrians and Gergithians near the Æolic Kymê, and the legendary stories of Trojan as well as Grecian heroes—Æneas and Odysseus—passed into the antiquarian imagination of Rome and Latium.³ The writers of the Augustan age knew Cumæ only in its decline, and wondered at the vast extent of its ancient walls, yet remaining in their time. But during the two centuries prior to 500 B.C., these walls enclosed a full and thriving population, in the plenitude of prosperity,—with a surrounding territory extensive as well as fertile,⁴ resorted to by purchasers of corn from Rome in years of scarcity, and unassailed as yet by formidable neighbours—and with a coast and harbours well-suited to maritime commerce. At that period the town of Capua (if indeed it existed at all) was of very inferior importance. The chief part of the rich plain around it was included in the possessions of Cumæ:⁵ not unworthy probably, in the sixth century B.C., to be numbered with Sybaris and Krotôn.

Prosperity
of Cumæ
between
700–500 B.C.

The decline of Cumæ begins in the first half of the fifth century B.C. (500–450 B.C.), first from the growth of hostile powers in

¹ Strabo, v. p. 243. Καὶ εἰσέπλεον γὰρ οἱ προθυσομένοι καὶ ἱλασόμενοι τοὺς κατὰ θρόνους δαίμονας, ὄντων τῶν ὑφηγομένων τὰ τοιαῦτα ἱερῶν, ἡργολαβηκῶν τὸν τόπον.

² Dionys. H. iv. 61, 62, vi. 21; Livy, ii. 34.

³ See, respecting the transmission of ideas and fables from the Æolic Kymê to Cumæ in Campania, the first volume of this History, chap. xv.

The father of Hesiod was a native of the Æolic Kymê: we find in the Hesiodic Theogony (*ad fin.*) mention of Latinus as the son of Odysseus and Circê: Servius cites the same from the Ἀσπιδοποιία of Hesiod (Servius ad Virg.

Æn. xii. 162; compare Cato, Fragment. p. 33, ed. Lion). The great family of the Mamiliî at Tusculum also derived their origin from Odysseus and Circê (Livy, i. 49).

The tomb of Elpênôr, the lost companion of Odysseus, was shown at Circê in the days of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. v. 8, 3) and Skylax (c. 10).

Hesiod notices the promontory of Pelôrus, the Strait of Messina, and the islet of Ortygia at Syracuse (Diodor. iv. 85; Strabo, i. p. 23).

⁴ Livy, ii. 9.

⁵ Niebuhr, Römisch. Geschichte, vol. i. p. 76, 2nd edit.

the interior—the Tuscans and Samnites—next from violent intestine dissensions and a destructive despotism. The town of Cumæ from 500 B.C. was assailed by a formidable host of invaders from the interior, Tuscans reinforced by Umbrian and Daunian allies; which Dionysius refers to the 64th Olympiad (524–520 B.C.), though upon what chronological authority we do not know, and though this same time is marked by Eusebius as the date of the foundation of Dikæarchia from Cumæ. The invaders, in spite of great disparity of number, were bravely repelled by the Cumæans, chiefly through the heroic example of a citizen then first known and distinguished—Aristodêmus Malakus. The government of the city was oligarchical, and the oligarchy from that day became jealous of Aristodêmus; who, on his part, acquired extraordinary popularity and influence among the people. Twenty years afterwards, the Latin city of Aricia, an ancient ally of Cumæ, being attacked by a Tuscan host, entreated succour from the Cumæans. The oligarchy of the latter thought this a good opportunity to rid themselves of Aristodêmus, whom they despatched by sea to Aricia, with rotten vessels and an insufficient body of troops. But their stratagem failed and proved their ruin; for the skill and intrepidity of Aristodêmus sufficed for the rescue of Aricia. He brought back his troops victorious and devoted to himself personally. He then, partly by force, partly by stratagem, subverted the oligarchy, put to death the principal rulers, and constituted himself despot. By a jealous energy, by disarming the people, and by a body of mercenaries, he maintained himself in this authority for twenty years, running his career of lust and iniquity until old age. At length a conspiracy of the oppressed population proved successful against him; he was slain with all his family, and many of his chief partisans, and the former government was restored.¹

The despotism of Aristodêmus falls during the exile of the expelled Tarquin² (to whom he gave shelter) from Rome, and during the government of Gêlon at Syracuse. Such a calamitous period of dissension and misrule was one of the great causes of the decline of Cumæ. Nearly at the same time, the Tuscan power, both by land and sea, appears at its maximum; while the Tuscan establishment at Capua also begins, if we adopt the æra of the town as given by Cato.³ There was thus created at the expense of Cumæ a powerful city, which was

¹ The history of Aristodêmus Malakus is given at some length by Dionysius of Halikarnassus (viii. 3–10).

² Livy, ii. 21.

³ Velleius Patercul. i. 5.

still farther aggrandised afterwards when conquered and occupied by the Samnites; whose invading tribes, under their own name or that of Lucanians, extended themselves during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. even to the shores of the Gulf of Tarentum.¹ Cumæ was also exposed to formidable dangers from the sea-side: a fleet either of Tuscans alone, or of Tuscans and Carthaginians united, assailed it in 474 B.C., when it was only rescued by the active interposition of Hiero despot of Syracuse; by whose naval force the invaders were repelled with slaughter.² These incidents go partly to indicate, partly to explain, the decline of the most ancient Hellenic settlement in Italy—a decline from which it never recovered.

After briefly sketching the history of Cumæ, we pass naturally to that series of powerful colonies which were established in Sicily and Italy beginning with 735 B.C.—enterprises in which Chalkis, Corinth, Megara, Sparta, the Achæans in Peloponnesus and the Lokrians out of Peloponnesus, were all concerned. Chalkis, the metropolis of Cumæ, became also the metropolis of Naxos, the most ancient Grecian colony in Sicily, on the eastern coast of the island, between the Strait of Messina and Mount Ætna.

The great number of Grecian settlements, from different colonising towns, which appear to have taken effect within a few years upon the eastern coast of Italy and Sicily—from the Iapygian Cape to Cape Pachynus—leads us to suppose that the extraordinary capacities of the country for receiving new settlers had become known only suddenly. The colonies follow so close upon each other, that the example of the first cannot have been the single determining motive to those which followed. I shall have occasion to point out, even a century later (on the occasion of the settlement of Kyrênê), the narrow range of Grecian navigation; so that the previous supposed ignorance would not be at all incredible, were it not for the fact of the pre-existing colony of Cumæ. According to the practice universal with Grecian ships—which rarely permitted themselves to lose sight of the coast except in cases of absolute necessity—every man, who navigated from Greece to Italy or Sicily, first coasted along the shores of Akarnania and Epirus until he reached the latitude of Korkyra; he then struck across first to that island, next to the Iapygian promontory, from whence he proceeded along the eastern coast of Italy (the Gulfs of Tarentum and Squillace) to the southern promontory of Calabria and the Sicilian Strait; he would then sail, still coastwise, either to Syracuse or to Cumæ,

Rapid multiplication of Grecian colonies in Sicily and Italy, beginning with 735 B.C.

¹ Compare Strabo, v. p. 250; vi. p. 124. | says Velleius, *l. c.*
264. "Cumanos Osca mutavit vicinia," | ² Diodor. xi. 51; Pindar. Pyth. i. 71.

according to his destination. So different are nautical habits now, that this fact requires special notice. We must recollect moreover, that in 735 B.C., there were yet no Grecian settlements either in Epirus or in Korkyra: outside of the Gulf of Corinth, the world was non-Hellenic, with the single exception of the remote Cumæ. A little before the last-mentioned period, Theoklês (an Athenian

Foundation
of Naxos in
Sicily by
Theoklês.

or a Chalkidian—probably the latter), being cast by storms on the coast of Sicily, became acquainted with the tempting character of the soil, as well as with the dispersed and half-organised condition of the petty Sikel communities who occupied it.¹ The oligarchy of Chalkis, acting upon the information which he brought back, sent out under his guidance settlers,² Chalkidian and Naxian, who founded the Sicilian Naxos. Theoklês and his companions on landing first occupied the eminence of Taurus, immediately overhanging the sea (whereon was established four centuries afterwards the town of Tauromenium, after Naxos had been destroyed by the Syracusan despot Dionysius); for they had to make good their position against the Sikels, who were in occupation of the neighbourhood, and whom it was requisite either to dispossess, or to subjugate. After they had acquired

Spot where
the Greeks
first landed
in Sicily—
memorable
afterwards.

secure possession of the territory, the site of the city was transferred to a convenient spot adjoining; but the hill first occupied remained ever memorable, both to Greeks and to Sikels. On it was erected the altar of Apollo Archêgetês, the divine patron who (through his oracle at Delphi) had sanctioned and determined Hellenic colonisation in the island. The altar remained permanently as a sanctuary, common to all the Sicilian Greeks, where the Theôrs or sacred envoys from their various cities, when they visited the Olympic and other festivals of Greece, were always in the habit of offering sacrifice immediately before their departure. To the indigenous Sikels who maintained their autonomy, on the other hand, the hill was an object of lasting but odious recollection, as the spot in which Grecian conquest and intrusion had first begun; so that at the distance of three centuries and a half from the event, we find them still animated by this sentiment in obstructing the foundation of Tauromenium.³

At the time when Theoklês landed, the Sikels were in possession

¹ Thucyd. vi. 3; Strabo, vi. p. 267.

² The admixture of Naxian colonists may be admitted, as well upon the presumption arising from the name, as from the statement of Hellanikus, ap. Stephan. Byz. v. Χαλκίς.

Ephorus put together into one the Chalkidian and the Megarian migrations, which Thucydides represents as distinct (Ephorus ap. Strabo. vi. p. 267).

³ Thucyd. vi. 3; Diodor. xiv. 59–88.

of the larger half of the island, lying chiefly to the east of the Heræan mountains¹—a continuous ridge stretching from north-west to south-east, distinct from that chain of detached mountains, much higher, called the Nebrodes, which run nearly parallel with the northern shore. West of the Heræan hills were situated the Sikans; and west of these latter, Eryx and Egesta, the possessions of the Elymi: along the western portion of the northern coast, also, were placed Motyê, Soloëis, and Panormus (now Palermo), the Phenician or Carthaginian seaports. The formation (or at least the extension) of these three last-mentioned ports, however, was a consequence of the multiplied Grecian colonies; for the Phenicians down to this time had not founded any territorial or permanent establishments, but had contented themselves with occupying in a temporary way various capes or circumjacent islets, for the purpose of trade with the interior. The arrival of formidable Greek settlers, maritime like themselves, induced them to abandon these outlying factories, and to concentrate their strength in the three considerable towns above-named, all near to that corner of the island which approached most closely to Carthage. The east side of Sicily, and most part of the south, were left open to the Greeks, with no other opposition than that of the indigenous Sikels and Sikans, who were gradually expelled from all contact with the sea-shore, except on part of the north side of the island—and who were indeed so unpractised at sea as well as destitute of shipping, that in the tale of their old migration out of Italy into Sicily, the Sikels were affirmed to have crossed the narrow strait upon rafts at a moment of favourable wind.²

In the very next year³ to the foundation of Naxos, Corinth began her part in the colonisation of the island. A body of settlers, under the Ekist Archias, landed in the islet of Syracuse. Ortygia, farther southward on the eastern coast, expelled the Sikel occupants, and laid the first stone of the mighty Syracuse. Ortygia, two English miles in circumference, was separated from the main island only by a narrow channel, which was bridged over when the city was occupied and enlarged by Gelôn in the 72nd Olympiad, if not earlier. It formed only a small part, though the most secure and best-fortified part, of the vast space which the city afterwards occupied. But it sufficed alone for the inhabitants

Ante-Hellenic distribution of Sicily.

B.C. 734.

Foundation of Syracuse.

¹ Mannert places the boundary of Sikels and Sikans at these mountains: Otto Siefert (*Akragas und sein Gebiet*, Hamburg, 1845, p. 53) places it at the Gemelli Colles, rather more to the westward—thus contracting the domain of

the Sikans: compare Diodor. iv. 82-83.

² Thucyd. vi. 2.

³ Mr. Fynes Clinton discusses the æra of Syracuse, *Fasti Hellenici*, ad B.C. 734, and the same work vol. ii. Appendix xi. p. 264.

during a considerable time, and the present city in its modern decline has again reverted to the same modest limits. Moreover Ortygia offered another advantage of not less value. It lay across the entrance of a spacious harbour, approached by a narrow mouth, and its fountain of Arethusa was memorable in antiquity both for abundance and goodness of water. We should have been glad to learn something respecting the numbers, character, position, nativity, &c. of these primitive emigrants, the founders of a city afterwards comprising a vast walled circuit, which Strabo reckons at 180 stadia, but which the modern observations of Colonel Leake announce as fourteen English miles,¹ or about 122 stadia. We are told only that many of them came from the Corinthian village of Tenea, and that one of them sold to a comrade on the voyage his lot of land in prospective, for the price of a honey-cake. The little which we hear about the determining motives² of the colony refers to the personal character of the œkist. Archias son of Euagêtus, one of the governing gens of the Bacchiadæ at Corinth, in the violent prosecution of unbridled lust, had caused, though unintentionally, the death of a free youth named Aktæon; whose father Melissus, after having vainly endeavoured to procure redress, slew himself at the Isthmian games, invoking the vengeance of Poseidon against the aggressor.³ Such were the destructive effects of this paternal curse, that Archias was compelled to expatriate. The Bacchiadæ placed him at the head of the emigrants to Ortygia, in 734 B.C.: at that time, probably, this was a sentence of banishment to which no man of commanding station would submit except under the pressure of necessity.

There yet remained room for new settlements between Naxos and Syracuse; and Theoklês, the œkist of Naxos, found himself in a situation to occupy part of this space only five years after the foundation of Syracuse: perhaps he may have been joined by fresh settlers. He attacked and expelled the Sikels⁴ from the fertile spot called Leontini, seemingly about half-way down on the eastern coast between Mount Ætna and Syracuse; and also from Katana, immediately adjoining to Mount Ætna, which still retains both its name and its importance. Two new Chalkidic colonies were thus founded—Theoklês himself becoming œkist of Leontini, and Euarchus, chosen by the Katanæan settlers themselves, of Katana.

The city of Megara was not behind Corinth and Chalkis in

¹ See Colonel Leake, notes on the Topography of Syracuse, p. 41.

² Athenæ. iv. 167; Strabo, ix. p. 380.

³ Diodor. Frag. Lit. viii. p. 24; Plu-

tarch, Narrat. Amator. p. 772; Schol. Apollon. Rhod. iv. 1212.

⁴ Polyænus (v. 5, 1) describes the stratagem of Theoklês on this occasion.

furnishing emigrants to Sicily. Lamis the Megarian, having now arrived with a body of colonists, took possession first of a new spot called Trotilus, but afterwards joined the recent Chalkidian settlement at Leontini. The two bodies of settlers, however, not living in harmony, Lamis, with his companions, was soon expelled; he then occupied Thapsus,¹ at a little distance to the northward of Ortygia or Syracuse, and shortly afterwards died. His followers made an alliance with Hyblôn, king of a neighbouring tribe of Sikels, who invited them to settle in his territory. They accepted the proposition, relinquished Thapsus, and founded, in conjunction with Hyblôn, the city called the Hyblæan Megara, between Leontini and Syracuse. This incident is the more worthy of notice, because it is one of the instances which we find of a Grecian colony beginning by amicable fusion with the pre-existing residents: Thucydidês seems to conceive the prince Hyblôn as betraying his people against their wishes to the Greeks.²

It was thus that, during the space of five years, several distinct bodies of Greek emigrants had rapidly succeeded each other in Sicily. For the next forty years, we do not hear of any fresh arrivals, which is the more easy to understand as there were during that interval several considerable foundations on the coast of Italy, which probably took off the disposable Greek settlers. At length, forty-five years after the foundation of Syracuse, a fresh body of settlers arrived; partly from Rhodes under Antiphêmus, partly from Krête under Entimus. They founded the city of Gela on the south-western front of the island, between Cape Pachynus and Lilybæum (B.C. 690)—still on the territory of the Sikels, though extending ultimately to a portion of that of the Sikans.³ The name of the city was given from that of the neighbouring river Gela.

One other fresh migration from Greece to Sicily remains to be mentioned, though we cannot assign the exact date of it. The town of Zanklê (now Messina), on the strait between Italy and Sicily, was at first occupied by certain privateers or pirates from Cumæ—the situation being eminently convenient for their operations. But the success of the other Chalkidic settlements imparted to this nest of pirates a more enlarged and honourable character. A body of new settlers joined them from Chalkis

¹ Polyænus details a treacherous stratagem whereby this expulsion is said to have been accomplished (v. 5, 2).

² Thucyd. vi. 3. "Ἰβλῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως προδόντος τὴν χώραν καὶ καθηγ-

σαμένου.

³ Thucyd. vi. 4; Diodor. Excerpt. Vatican. ed. Maii, Fragm. xiii. p. 13; Pausanias, viii. 46, 2.

and other towns of Eubœa, the land was regularly divided, and two joint œkists were provided to qualify the town as a member of the Hellenic communion—Periêrês from Chalkis, and Kratæmenês from Cumæ. The name Zanklê had been given by the primitive Sikel occupants of the place, meaning in their language *a sickle*; but it was afterwards changed to Messênê by Anaxilas despot of Rhegium, who, when he conquered the town, introduced new inhabitants in a manner hereafter to be noticed.¹

Besides these emigrations direct from Greece, the Hellenic colonies in Sicily became themselves the founders of sub-colonies. Thus the Syracusans, seventy years after their own settlement (B.C. 664), founded Akraë—Kasmenæ, twenty years afterwards (B.C. 644), and Kamarina forty-five years after Kasmenæ (B.C. 599): Daskôn and Menekôlus were the œkists of the latter, which became in process of time an independent and considerable town, while Akraë and Kasmenæ seem to have remained subject to Syracuse. Kamarina was on the south-western side of the island, forming the boundary of the Syracusan territory towards Gela. Kallipolis was established from Naxos, and Eubœa (a town so called) from Leontini.²

Hitherto the Greeks had colonised altogether on the territory of the Sikels. But the three towns which remain to be mentioned were all founded in that of the Sikans³—Agrigentum or Akragas—Selinûs—and Himera. The two former were both on the south-western coast—Agrigentum bordering upon Gela on the one side and upon Selinûs on the other. Himera was situated on the westerly portion of the northern coast—the single Hellenic establishment, in the time of Thucydidês, which that long line of coast presented. The inhabitants of the Hyblæan Megara were founders of Selinûs, about 630 B.C., a century after their own establishment. The œkist Pamillus, according to the usual Hellenic practice, was invited from their metropolis Megara in Greece Proper, but we are not told how many fresh settlers came with him: the language of Thucydidês leads us to suppose that the new town was peopled chiefly from the Hyblæan Megarians themselves. The town of Akragas or Agrigentum, called after the neighbouring river of the former name,

¹ Thucyd. vi. 4.

² Strabo, vi. p. 272.

³ Stephanus Byz. Σικανία, ἡ περίχωρος Ἀκραγαντινῶν. Herodot. vii. 170; Diodor. iv. 78.

Vessa, the most considerable among

the Sikanian townships or villages, with its prince Teutus, is said to have been conquered by Phalaris despot of Agrigentum, through a mixture of craft and force (Polyæn. v. 1, 4).

was founded from Gela in B.C. 582. Its ækists were Aristonous and Pystilus, and it received the statutes and religious characteristics of Gela. Himera, on the other hand, was founded from Zanklê, under three ækists, Eukleidês, Simus, and Sakôn. The chief part of its inhabitants were of Chalkidic race, and its legal and religious characteristics were Chalkidic. But a portion of the settlers were Syracusan exiles, called Mylêtidæ, who had been expelled from home by a sedition, so that the Himeræan dialect was a mixture of Doric and Chalkidic. Himera was situated not far from the towns of the Elymi—Eryx and Egesta.

Such were the chief establishments founded by the Greeks in Sicily during the two centuries after their first settlement in 735 B.C. The few particulars just stated respecting them are worthy of all confidence—for they come to us from Thucydidês—but they are unfortunately too few to afford the least satisfaction to our curiosity. It cannot be doubted that these first two centuries were periods of steady increase and prosperity among the Sicilian Greeks, undisturbed by those distractions and calamities which supervened afterwards, and which led indeed to the extraordinary aggrandisement of some of their communities, but also to the ruin of several others. Moreover it seems that the Carthaginians in Sicily gave them no trouble until the time of Gelôn. Their position will indeed seem singularly advantageous, if we consider the extraordinary fertility of the soil in this fine island, especially near the sea—its capacity for corn, wine and oil, the species of cultivation to which the Greek husbandman had been accustomed under less favourable circumstances—its abundant fisheries on the coast, so important in Grecian diet, and continuing undiminished even at the present day—together with sheep, cattle, hides, wool, and timber from the native population in the interior. These natives seem to have been of rude pastoral habits, dispersed either among petty hill-villages, or in caverns hewn out of the rock, like the primitive inhabitants of the Balearic islands and Sardinia; so that Sicily, like New Zealand in our century, was now for the first time approached by organised industry and tillage.¹ Their progress, though very great, during this most

Prosperity of
the Sicilian
Greeks.

¹ Of these Sikel or Sikan caverns many traces yet remain: see Otto Siefert, *Akragas und sein Gebiet*, pp. 39, 45, 49, 55, and the work of Captain W. H. Smyth—*Sicily and its Islands*, London, 1824, p. 190.

“These cryptæ (observes the latter) appear to have been the earliest effort

of a primitive and pastoral people towards a town, and are generally without regularity as to shape and magnitude: in after-ages they perhaps served as a retreat in time of danger, and as a place of security, in case of extraordinary alarm, for women, children, and valuables. In this light, I was particularly

prosperous interval (between the foundation of Naxos in 735 B.C. to the reign of Gelôn at Syracuse in 485 B.C.), is not to be compared to that of the English colonies in America; but it was nevertheless very great, and appears greater from being concentrated as it was in and around a few cities. Individual spreading and separation of residence were rare, nor did they consist either with the security or the social feelings of a Grecian colonist. The city to which he belonged was the central point of his existence, where the produce which he raised was brought home to be stored or sold, and where alone his active life, political, domestic, religious, recreative, &c., was carried on. There were dispersed throughout the territory of the city small fortified places and garrisons,¹ serving as temporary protection to the cultivators in case of sudden inroad; but there was no permanent residence for the free citizen except the town itself. This was, perhaps, even more the case in a colonial settlement, where everything began and spread from one central point, than in Attica, where the separate villages had once nourished a population politically independent. It was in the town, therefore, that the aggregate increase of the colony palpably concentrated itself—property as well as population—private comfort and luxury not less than public force and grandeur. Such growth and improvement was of course sustained by the cultivation of the territory, but the evidences of it were most manifest in the town. The large population which we shall have occasion to notice as belonging to Agrigentum, Sybaris, and other cities, will illustrate this position.

There is another point of some importance to mention in regard to the Sicilian and Italian cities. The population of the town itself may have been principally, though not wholly, Greek; but the population of the territory belonging to the town, or of the dependent villages which covered it, must have been in a great measure Sikel or Sikan. The proof of this is found in a

struck with the resemblance these rude habitations bore to the caves I had seen in Owhyhee, for similar uses. The Troglodyte villages of Northern Africa, of which I saw several, are also precisely the same.

"The rock caves of Sicily are remarkable. The southern walls of Agrigentum are formed of a continued line of rocks which supported the town. In the inside of this natural wall are excavated the tombs of (probably) the principal citizens. The very interesting

ruins of little Akraë, high up in the Heræan range, nestle under a cliff in which numbers of tombs are excavated. The Necropolis of Syracuse, between Achradina and the Great Harbour, is composed of similar rock excavations; and there are subterraneous galleries or catacombs also high up in Epipolæ."

About the early cave-residences in Sardinia and the Balearic islands, consult Diodor. v. 15-17.

¹ Thucyd. vi. 45. τὰ περιπόλια τὰ ἐν τῇ χάρα (of Syracuse).

circumstance common to all the Sicilian and Italian Greeks—the peculiarity of their weights, measures, monetary system, and language. The pound and ounce are divisions and denominations belonging altogether to Italy and Sicily, and unknown originally to the Greeks, whose scale consisted of the obolus, the drachma, the mina, and the talent. Among the Greeks, too, the metal first and most commonly employed for money was silver, while in Italy and Sicily copper was the primitive metal made use of. Now among all the Italian and Sicilian Greeks a scale of weight and money arose quite different from that of the Greeks at home, formed by a combination and adjustment of the one of these systems to the other. It is in many points complex and difficult to understand, but in the final result the native system seems to be predominant, and the Grecian system subordinate.¹ Such a consequence as this could not have ensued, if the Greek settlers in Italy and Sicily had kept themselves apart as communities, and had merely carried on commerce and barter with communities of Sikels. It implies a fusion of the two races in the same community, though doubtless in the relation of superior and subject, and not in that of equals. The Greeks on arriving in the island expelled the natives from the town, perhaps also from the lands immediately round the town. But when they gradually extended their territory, this was probably accomplished, not by the expulsion, but by the subjugation, of those Sikel tribes, whose villages, much subdivided and each individually petty, their aggressions successively touched.

Peculiarity of the monetary and statal system among the Sicilian and Italian Greeks.

At the time when Theoklêtes landed on the hill near Naxos, and Archias in the islet of Ortygia, and when each of them expelled the Sikels from that particular spot, there were Sikel villages or little communities spread through all the neighbouring country. By the gradual encroachments of the colony, some of these might

¹ Respecting the statical and monetary system, prevalent among the Italian and Sicilian Greeks, see Aristot. *Fragment. περὶ Πολιτειῶν*, ed. Neumann, p. 102; Pollux, iv. 174, ix. 80–87; and above all, Boeckh, *Metrologie*, ch. xviii. p. 292, and the abstract and review of that work in the *Classical Museum*, No. 1; also O. Müller, *Die Etrusker*, vol. i. p. 309.

The Sicilian Greeks reckoned by talents, each consisting of 120 litræ or libræ: the Æginæan obolus was the equivalent of the litra, having been the value in silver of a pound weight of

copper, at the time when the valuation was taken.

The common denominations of money and weight (with the exception of the talent, the meaning of which was altered while the word was retained) seem to have been all borrowed by the Italian and Sicilian Greeks from the Sikel or Italic scale, not from the Grecian—*νοῦμος*, *λίτρα*, *δεκάλιτρον*, *πεντηκοντάλιτρον*, *πεντούργκιον*, *ἐξᾶς*, *τετράς*, *τριᾶς*, *ἡμίνα*, *ἡμιλίτρον* (see *Fragments of Epicharmus* and *Sophron*, ap. Ahrens de *Dialecto Doricâ*, Appendix, pp. 435, 471, 472, and *Athenæ*. xi. p. 479).

be dispossessed and driven out of the plains near the coast into the more mountainous regions of the interior. But many of them doubtless found it convenient to submit, to surrender a portion of their lands, and to hold the rest as subordinate villagers of an Hellenic city community.¹ We find even at the time of the Athenian invasion (414 B.C.) villages existing in distinct identity as Sikels, yet subject and tributary to Syracuse.

Moreover the influence which the Greeks exercised, though in the first instance essentially compulsory, became also in part self-operating—the ascendancy of a higher over a lower civilization. It was the working of concentrated townsmen, safe among one another by their walls and by mutual confidence, and surrounded by more or less of ornament, public as well as private—upon dispersed, unprotected, artless villagers, who could not be insensible to the charm of that superior intellect, imagination, and organisation, which wrought so powerfully upon the whole contemporaneous world. To understand the action of these superior immigrants upon the native but inferior Sikels, during those three earliest centuries (730-430 B.C.) which followed the arrival of Archias and Theoklês, we have only to study the continuance of the same action during the three succeeding centuries which preceded the age of Cicero. At the period when Athens undertook the siege of Syracuse (B.C. 415), the interior of the island was occupied by Sikel and Sikan communities, autonomous and retaining their native customs and language.² But in the time of Verres and Cicero (three centuries and a half afterwards) the interior of the island as well as the maritime regions had become hellenised: the towns in the interior were then hardly less Greek than those on the coast. Cicero contrasts favourably the character of the Sicilians with that of the Greeks generally (*i. e.* the Greeks out of Sicily), but he nowhere distinguishes Greeks in Sicily from native Sikels;³ nor Enna and Cen-

¹ Thucyd. vi. 88.

² Thucyd. vi. 62-87; vii. 13.

³ Cicero in Verrem, Act. ii. lib. iv. c. 26-51; Diodor. v. 6.

Contrast the manner in which Cicero speaks of Agyrium, Centuripi and Enna, with the description of these places as inhabited by autonomous Sikels, B.C. 396, in the wars of the elder Dionysius (Diodor. xiv. 55, 58, 78). Both Sikans and Sikels were at that time completely distinguished from the Greeks, in the centre of the island.

O. Müller states that "Syracuse

seventy years after its foundation colonised Akraë, also Enna, situated in the centre of the island" (Hist. of Dorians, i. 6, 7). Enna is mentioned by Stephanus Byz. as a Syracusan foundation, but without notice of the date of its foundation, which must have been much later than Müller here affirms. Serra di Falco (Antichità di Sicilia, Introd. t. i. p. 9) gives Enna as having been founded later than Akraë, but earlier than Kasmenæ; for which date I find no authority. Talaria (see Steph. Byz. *ad voc.*) is also mentioned as an-

turipi from Katana and Agrigentum. The little Sikel villages became gradually semi-hellenised and merged into subjects of a Grecian town: during the first three centuries, this change took place in the regions of the coast—during the following three centuries, in the regions of the interior; and probably with greater rapidity and effect in the earlier period, not only because the action of the Grecian communities was then closer, more concentrated, and more compulsory, but because also the obstinate tribes could then retire into the interior.

The Greeks in Sicily are thus not to be considered as purely Greeks, but as modified by a mixture of Sikel and Sikan language, customs, and character. Each town included in its non-privileged population a number of semi-hellenised Sikels (or Sikans, as the case might be), who though in a state of dependence, contributed to mix the breed and influence the entire mass. We have no reason to suppose that the Sikel or Ænotrian language ever became written, like Latin, Oscan, or Umbrian.¹ The inscriptions of Segesta and Halesus are all in Doric Greek, which supplanted the native tongue for public purposes as a separate language, but not without becoming itself modified in the confluence. In following the ever-renewed succession of violent political changes, the inferior capacity of regulated and pacific popular government, and the more unrestrained voluptuous licence—which the Sicilian and Italian Greeks² exhibit as compared with Athens and the cities of Greece Proper—we must call to mind that we are not dealing with pure Hellenism; and that the native element, though not unfavourable to activity or increase of wealth, prevented the Grecian colonist from partaking fully in that improved organisation which we so distinctly trace in Athens from Solon downwards. How much the taste, habits, ideas, religion, and local mythes, of the native Sikels passed into the minds of the Sikeliots or Sicilian Greeks, is shown by the character of their literature and poetry. Sicily was the native country of that rustic mirth and village buffoonery which gave birth to the primitive comedy—politicised and altered at Athens so as to suit men of the market-place, the ekklesia, and the dikastery—blending, in the comedies of the Syracusan Epicharmus, copious details about the indulgences of the table (for which the ancient Sicilians were renowned) with Pythagorean philosophy and moral maxims—

Difference
between the
Greeks in
Sicily and
those in
Greece Pro-
per.

other Syracusan city, of which we do not know either the date or the particulars of foundation.

¹ Ahrens, *De Dialecto Doricâ*, sect.

1. p. 3.

² Plato, *Epistol.* vii. p. 326; Plautus, *Rudens*, Act. i. Sc. i. 56; Act. ii. Sc.

vi. 58.

but given with all the naked simplicity of common life, in a sort of rhythmical prose without even the restraint of a fixed metre, by the Syracusan Sophrôn in his lost Mimes, and afterwards polished as well as idealised in the Bucolic poetry of Theokritus.¹ That which is commonly termed the Doric comedy was, in great part at least, the Sikel comedy taken up by Dorian composers—the Doric race and dialect being decidedly predominant in Sicily. The manners thus dramatised belonged to that coarser vein of humour which the Doric Greeks of the town had in common with the semi-hellenised Sikels of the circumjacent villages. Moreover it seems probable that this rustic population enabled the despots of the Greco-Sicilian towns to form easily and cheaply those bodies of mercenary troops, by whom their power was sustained,² and whose presence rendered the continuance of popular government, even supposing it begun, all but impossible.

It was the destiny of most of the Grecian colonial establishments to perish by the growth and aggression of those inland powers upon whose coast they were planted; powers which gradually acquired, from the vicinity of the Greeks, a military and political organisation, and a power of concentrated action, such as they had not originally possessed. But in Sicily the Sikels were not numerous enough even to maintain permanently their own nationality, and were ultimately penetrated on all sides by Hellenic ascendancy and manners. We shall nevertheless come to one remarkable attempt, made by a native Sikel prince in the 82nd Olympiad (455 B.C.)—the enterprising Duketius—to group many Sikel petty villages into one considerable town, and thus to raise his countrymen into the Grecian stage of polity and organisation. Had there been any Sikel prince endowed with these superior ideas at the time

Native population in Sicily not numerous enough to become formidable to the Greek settlers.

Sikel prince Duketius.

¹ Timokreon, Fragment. 5 ap. Ahrens, *De Dialecto Doricâ*, p. 478—*Σικελὸς κομῶνδς ἀνὴρ Ποτὶ τὰν ματέρ' ἔφα.*

Bernhardy, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Griech.* Litteratur, vol. ii. ch. 120. sect. 2-5; Gysar, *De Doriensium Comœdia*. Cologne, 1828, ch. i. pp. 41, 55, 57, 210; Boeckh, *De Græcæ Tragœd.* Princip. p. 52; Aristot. ap. Athenæ. xi. 505. The *κότταβος* seems to have been a native Sikel fashion, borrowed by the Greeks (Athenæus, xv. pp. 666-668).

The Sicilian *βουκολιασμὸς* was a fashion among the Sicilian herdsmen earlier than Epicharmus, who noticed the alleged inventor of it, Diomus, the *βοῦκόλος Σικελιώτης* (Athenæ. xiv. p. 619). The

rustic manners and speech represented in the Sicilian comedy are contrasted with the town manners and speech of the Attic comedy, by Plautus, *Persæ*, Act. iii. Sc. i. v. 31:—

“*Librorum eccillum habeo plenum soracum.
Dabuntur dotis tibi inde sexcenti logi,
Atque Attici omnes, nullum Siculum acciperis.*”

Compare the beginning of the prologue to the *Menæchmi* of Plautus.

The comic *μῦθος* began at Syracuse with Epicharmus and Phormis (Aristot. *Poet.* v. 5).

² Zenobius, *Proverb.* v. 84—*Σικελὸς στρατιώτης.*

when the Greeks first settled in Sicily, the subsequent history of the island would probably have been very different. But Duketius had derived his projects from the spectacle of the Grecian towns around him, and these latter had acquired much too great power to permit him to succeed. The description of his abortive attempt, however, which we find in Diodorus,¹ meagre as it is, forms an interesting point in the history of the island.

Grecian colonisation in Italy began nearly at the same time as in Sicily, and was marked by the same general circumstances. Placing ourselves at Rhegium (now Reggio) on the Sicilian strait, we trace Greek cities gradually planted on various points of the coast as far as Cumæ on the one sea and Tarentum (Taranto) on the other. Between the two seas runs the lofty chain of the Apennines, calcareous in the upper part of its course, throughout Middle Italy—granitic and schistose in the lower part, where it traverses the territories now called the Hither and the Farther Calabria. The plains and valleys on each side of the Calabrian Apennines exhibit a luxuriance of vegetation extolled by all observers, and surpassing even that of Sicily;² and great as the productive powers of this territory are now, there is full reason for believing that they must have been far greater in ancient times. For it has been visited by repeated earthquakes, each of which has left calamitous marks of devastation. Those of 1638 and 1783 (especially the latter, whose destructive effects were on a terrific scale both as to life and property³) are of a date sufficiently recent to admit of recording and measuring the damage done by each; and that damage, in many parts of the southwestern coast, was great and irreparable. Animated as the epithets are, therefore, with which the modern tra-

Grecian colonies in Southern Italy.

Native population and territory.

¹ Diodor. xi. 90, 91; xii. 9.

² See Dolomieu, Dissertation on the Earthquakes of Calabria Ultra in 1783, in Pinkerton, Collection of Voyages and Travels, vol. v. p. 280.

"It is impossible (he observes) to form an adequate idea of the fertility of Calabria Ultra, particularly of that part called the Plain (south-west of the Apennines below the Gulf of St. Eufemia). The fields, productive of olive-trees of larger growth than any seen elsewhere, are yet productive of grain. Vines load with their branches the trees on which they grow, yet lessen not their crops. All things grow there, and nature seems to anticipate the wishes of the husbandman. There is never a sufficiency of

hands to gather the whole of the olives, which finally fall and rot at the bottom of the trees that bore them, in the months of February and March. Crowds of foreigners, principally Sicilians, come there to help to gather them, and share the produce with the grower. Oil is their chief article of exportation: in every quarter their wines are good and precious." Compare pp. 278–282.

³ Mr. Keppel Craven observes (Tour through the Southern Provinces of Naples, ch. xiii. p. 254), "The earthquake of 1783 may be said to have altered the face of the whole of Calabria Ultra, and extended its ravages as far northward as Cosenza."

veller paints the present fertility of Calabria, we are warranted in enlarging their meaning when we conceive the country as it stood between 720-320 B.C., the period of Grecian occupation and independence; while the unhealthy air which now desolates the plains generally, seems then to have been felt only to a limited extent, and over particular localities. The founders of Tarentum, Sybaris, Krotôn, Lokri, and Rhegium, planted themselves in situations of unexampled promise to the industrious cultivator, which the previous inhabitants had turned to little account; though since the subjugation of the Grecian cities, these once rich possessions have sunk into poverty and depopulation, especially during the last three centuries, from insalubrity, indolence, bad administration, and fear of the Barbary corsairs.

The Ænotrians, Sikels, or Italians, who were in possession of these territories in 720 B.C., seem to have been rude petty communities—procuring for themselves safety by residence on lofty eminences—more pastoral than agricultural, and some of them consuming the produce of their fields in common mess, on a principle analogous to the *syssitia* of Sparta or Krête. King Italus was said to have introduced this peculiarity¹ among the southernmost portion of the Ænotrian population, and at the same time to have bestowed upon them the name of Italians, though they were also known by the name of Sikels. Throughout the centre of Calabria between sea and sea, the high chain of the Apennines afforded protection to a certain extent both to their independence and to their pastoral habits. But these heights are made to be enjoyed in conjunction with the plains beneath, so as to alternate winter and summer pasture for the cattle. It is in this manner that the richness of the country is rendered available, since a large portion of the mountain range is buried in snow during the winter months. Such remarkable diversity of soil and climate rendered Calabria a land of promise for Grecian settlement. The plains and lower eminences were as productive in corn, wine, oil, and flax, as the mountains in summer-pasture and timber—and abundance of rain falls upon the higher ground, which requires only industry and care to be made to impart the maximum of fertility to the lower. Moreover a long line of sea-coast (though not well furnished with harbours) and an abundant supply of fish, came in aid of the advantages of the soil. While the poorer freemen of the Grecian cities were enabled to obtain small lots of fertile land in the neighbourhood, to be cultivated by their own hands, and to

¹ Aristot. Polit. vii. 9, 3.

provide for the most part their own food and clothing—the richer proprietors made profitable use of the more distant portions of the territory by means of their cattle, sheep, and slaves.

Of the Grecian towns on this favoured coast, the earliest as well as the most prosperous were, Sybaris and Krotón: both in the Gulf of Tarentum—both of Achæan origin—and conterminous with each other in respect of territory. Krotón was placed not far to the west of the south-eastern extremity of the Gulf, called in ancient times the Lakinian cape, and ennobled by the temple of the Lakinian Hêrê, which became alike venerated and adorned by the Greek resident as well as by the passing navigator. One solitary column of the temple, the humble remnant of its past magnificence, yet marks the extremity of this once-celebrated promontory. Sybaris seems to have been planted in the year 720 B.C., Krotón in 710 B.C.: Iselikeus was ækist of the former,¹ Myskellus of the latter. This large Achæan emigration seems to have been connected with the previous expulsion of the Achæan population from the more southerly region of Peloponnesus by the Dorians, though in what precise manner we are not enabled to see. The Achæan towns in Peloponnesus appear in later times too inconsiderable to furnish emigrants, but probably in the eighth century B.C. their population may have been larger. The town of Sybaris was planted between two rivers, the Sybaris and the Krathis² (the name of the latter borrowed from a river of Achaia); the town of Krotón about twenty-five miles distant, on the river Æsarus. The primitive settlers of Sybaris consisted in part of Trœzenians, who were however subsequently expelled by the more numerous Achæans—a deed of violence which was construed by the religious sentiment of Antiochus and some other Grecian historians, as having drawn down upon them the anger of the gods in the ultimate destruction of the city by the Krotoniates.³

The fatal contest between these two cities, which ended in the ruin of Sybaris, took place in 510 B.C., after the latter had subsisted in growing prosperity for 210 years. And the astonishing

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 263. Kramer in his new edition of Strabo follows Koray in suspecting the correctness of the name Ἰσελικεύς, which certainly departs from the usual analogy of Grecian names. Assuming it to be incorrect, however, there are no means of rectifying it: Kramer prints—οἰκιστὴς δὲ αὐτῆς ὁ Ἴσ . . . Ἑλικεύς: thus making Ἑλικεύς the ethnicon of the Achæan town Helikê.

There were also legends which connected the foundation of Krotón with Hêraklês, who was affirmed to have been hospitably sheltered by the eponymous hero Krotón. Hêraklês was οἰκεῖος at Krotón: see Ovid, Metamorph. xv. 1-60; Jamblichus, Vit. Pythagor. c. 8. p. 30, c. 9. p. 37, ed. Kuster.

² Herodot. i. 145.

³ Aristot. Polit. v. 2, 10.

prosperity to which both of them attained is a sufficient proof that during most of this period they had remained in peace at least, if not in alliance and common Achæan brotherhood. Unfortunately, the general fact of their great size, wealth and power, is all that we are permitted to know. The walls of Sybaris embraced a circuit of fifty stadia, or near six miles, while those of Krotôn were even larger, comprising little less than twelve miles.¹ A large walled circuit was advantageous for sheltering the moveable property in the territory around, which was carried in on the arrival of an invading enemy. Both cities possessed an extensive dominion across the Calabrian peninsula from sea to sea. But the territorial range of Sybaris seems to have been greater and her colonies wider and more distant—a fact which may perhaps explain the smaller circuit of the city.

The Sybarites were founders of Laus and Skidrus, on the Mediterranean Sea in the Gulf of Policastro, and even of the more distant Poseidonia—now known by its Latin name of Pæstum, as well as by the temples which still remain to decorate its deserted site. They possessed twenty-five dependent towns, and ruled over four distinct native tribes or nations. What these nations were we are not told,² but they were probably different sections of the Ænotrian name. The Krotoniates also reached across to the Mediterranean Sea, and founded (upon the gulf now called St. Euphemia) the town of Terina, and seemingly also that of Lametini.³ The inhabitants of the Epizephyrian Lokri, which was situated in a more southern part of Calabria Ultra near the modern town of Gerace, extended themselves in like manner across the peninsula. They founded upon the Mediterranean coast the towns of Hippônium, Medma, and Mataurum,⁴ as well as Melæ and Itoneia, in localities not now exactly ascertained.

Myskellus of Rhypes in Achaia, the founder of Krotôn under the express indication of the Delphian oracle, is said to have thought the site of Sybaris preferable, and to have solicited permission from the oracle to plant his colony there, but he was admonished to obey strictly the directions first given.⁵

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 262; Livy, xxiv. 3.

² Strabo, vi. p. 263, v. p. 251; Skymn. Chi. v. 244; Herodot. vi. 21.

³ Stephan. Byz. v. Τέρινα—Δαμητῖνοι; Skymn. Chi. 305.

⁴ Thucyd. v. 5; Strabo, vi. p. 256; Skymn. Chi. 307. Steph. Byz. calls Mataurum πόλις Σικελίας.

⁵ Herodot. viii. 47. Κροτωνιῆται, γένος εἶσιν Ἀχαιοί: the date of the foundation is given by Dionysius of Halikarnassus (A. R. ii. 59).

The oracular commands delivered to Myskellus are found at length in the Fragments of Diodorus, published by Maii (Scriptt. Vet. Fragm. x. p. 8):

It is farther affirmed that the foundation of Krotôn was aided by Archias, then passing along the coast with his settlers for Syracuse, who is also brought into conjunction in a similar manner with the foundation of Lokri: but neither of these statements appears chronologically admissible.

The Italian Lokri (called Epizephyrian, from the neighbourhood of Cape Zephyrium) was founded in the year 683 B.C. by settlers from the Lokrians—either the Ozolian Lokrians in the Krissæan Gulf, or those of Opus on the Eubœan Strait. This point was disputed even in antiquity, and perhaps both the one and the other may have contributed: Euanthus was the œkist of the place.¹ The first years of the Epizephyrian Lokri are said to have been years of sedition and discord. And the vile character which we hear ascribed to the primitive colonists, as well as their perfidious dealing with the natives, are the more to be noted, as the Lokrians, of the times both of Aristotle and of Polybius, fully believed these statements in regard to their own ancestors.

The original emigrants to Lokri were, according to Aristotle, a body of runaway slaves, men-stealers, and adulterers, whose only legitimate connexion with an honourable Hellenic root arose from a certain number of well-born Lokrian women who accompanied them. These women belonged to those select families called the Hundred Houses, who constituted what may be called the nobility of the Lokrians in Greece Proper, and their descendants continued to enjoy a certain rank and pre-eminence in the colony, even in the time of Polybius. The emigration is said to have been occasioned by disorderly intercourse between these noble Lokrian women and their slaves—perhaps by intermarriage with persons of inferior station where there had existed no recognised *connubium*; ² a fact referred, by the informants of Aristotle, to the long duration of the first

Original settlers of Lokri—their character and circumstances.

compare Zenob. Proverb. Centur. iii. 42.

Though Myskellus is thus given as the œkist of Krotôn, yet we find a Krotoniatæ coin with the inscription 'Ἡρακλῆς Οἰκίστας (Eckhel, Doctrin. Numm. Vet. vol. i. p. 172): the worship of Hēraklēs at Krotôn under this title is analogous to that of 'Απολλών Οἰκίστης καὶ Δωματίτης at Ægina (Pythænētus ap. Schol. Pindar. Nem. v. 81). There were various legends respecting Hēraklēs, the Eponymus Krotôn, and Lakinus. Herakleidēs Ponticus, Fragm.

30, ed. Köller; Diodor. iv. 24; Ovid, Metamorph. xv. 1-53.

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 259. Euantheia, Hy-antheia, or Eantheia, was one of the towns of the Ozolian Lokrians on the north side of the Krissæan Gulf, from which perhaps the emigrants may have departed, carrying with them the name and patronage of its eponymous œkist (Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. c. 15; Skylax, p. 14).

² Polyb. xii. 5, 8, 9; Dionys. Perieget. v. 365.

Messenian war—the Lokrian warriors having for the most part continued in the Messenian territory as auxiliaries of the Spartans during the twenty years of that war,¹ permitting themselves only rare and short visits to their homes. This is a story resembling that which we shall find in explanation of the colony of Tarentum. It comes to us too imperfectly to admit of criticism or verification; but the unamiable character of the first emigrants is a statement deserving credit, and very unlikely to have been invented. Their first proceedings on settling in Italy display a perfidy in accordance with the character ascribed to them. They found the territory in this southern portion of the Calabrian peninsula possessed by native Sikels, who, alarmed at their force and afraid to try the hazard of resistance, agreed to admit them to a participation and joint residence. The covenant was concluded and sworn to by both parties in the following terms:—“There shall be friendship between us, and we will enjoy the land in common, so long as we stand upon this earth and have heads upon our shoulders.” At the time when the oath was taken, the Lokrians had put earth into their shoes and concealed heads of garlic upon their shoulders; so that when they had divested themselves of these appendages, the oath was considered as no longer binding. Availing themselves of the first convenient opportunity, they attacked the Sikels by surprise and drove them out of the territory, of which they thus acquired the exclusive possession.² Their first establishment was formed upon the headland itself, Cape Zephyrium (now Bruzzano). But after three or four years the site of the town was moved to an eminence in the neighbouring plain, in which the Syracusans are said to have aided them.³

In describing the Grecian settlers in Sicily, I have already stated that they are to be considered as Greeks with a considerable infusion of blood, of habits, and of manners, from the native Sikels. The case is the same with the Italiots or Italian Greeks, and in respect to these Epizephyrian Lokrians, especially, we find it expressly noticed by Polybius. Composed as their band was of ignoble and worthless

Treachery
towards the
indigenous
Sikels.

Mixture of
Sikels in
their terri-
tory—Sikel
customs
adopted.

¹ This fact may connect the foundation of the colony of Lokri with Sparta; but the statement of Pausanias (iii. 3, 1), that the Spartans in the reign of king Polydorus founded both Lokri and Krotôn, seems to belong to a different historical conception.

² Polyb. xii. 5–12.

³ Strabo, vi. p. 259. We find that in

the accounts given of the foundation of Korkyra, Krotôn, and Lokri, reference is made to the Syracusan settlers, either as contemporaries in the way of companionship, or as auxiliaries: perhaps the accounts all come from the Syracusan historian Antiochus, who exaggerated the intervention of his own ancestors.

men, not bound together by strong tribe-feelings or traditional customs, they were the more ready to adopt new practices, as well religious as civil,¹ from the Sikels. One in particular is noticed by the historian—the religious dignity called the Phialêphorus or Censer-bearer, enjoyed among the native Sikels by a youth of noble birth, who performed the duties belonging to it in their sacrifices; but the Lokrians, while they identified themselves with the religious ceremony and adopted both the name and the dignity, altered the sex and conferred it upon one of those women of noble blood who constituted the ornament of their settlement. Even down to the days of Polybius, some maiden descended from one of these select Hundred Houses still continued to bear the title and to perform the ceremonial duties of Phialêphorus. We learn from these statements how large a portion of Sikels must have become incorporated as dependents in the colony of the Epizephyrian Lokri, and how strongly marked was the intermixture of their habits with those of the Greek settlers; while the tracing back among them of all eminence of descent to a few emigrant women of noble birth, is a peculiarity belonging exclusively to their city.

That a body of colonists, formed of such unpromising materials, should have fallen into much lawlessness and disorder, is noway surprising; but these mischiefs appear to have become so utterly intolerable in the early years of the colony, as to force upon every one the necessity of some remedy. Hence arose a phenomenon new in the march of Grecian society—the first promulgation of written laws. The Epizephyrian Lokrians, having applied to the Delphian oracle for some healing suggestion under their distress, were directed to make laws for themselves;² and received the ordinances of a shepherd named Zaleukus, which he pro-
Lokrian
lawgiver—
Zaleukus.

fessed to have learnt from the goddess Athênê in a dream. His laws are said to have been put in writing and promulgated in 664 B.C., forty years earlier than those of Drako at Athens.

That these first of all Grecian written laws were few and simple, we may be sufficiently assured. The only fact certain respecting them is their extraordinary rigour:³ they seem to have enjoined the application of the *lex talionis*

Rigour of
his laws—
government
of Lokri.

¹ "Nil patrium, nisi nomen, habet Romanus alumnus," observes Propertius (iv. 37) respecting the Romans: repeated with still greater bitterness in the epistle in Sallust from Mithridatês to Arsacês (p. 191, Delph. ed.). The

remark is well-applicable to Lokri.

² Aristot. ap. Schol. Pindar. Olymp. x. 17.

³ Proverb. Zenob. Centur. iv. 20. Ζαλεῦκου νόμος, ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποτόμων.

as a punishment for personal injuries. In this general character of his laws, Zaleukus was the counterpart of Drako. But so little was certainly known, and so much falsely asserted, respecting him, that Timæus the historian went so far as to call in question his real existence¹—against the authority not only of Ephorus, but also of Aristotle and Theophrastus. The laws must have remained however, for a long time, formally unchanged; for so great was the aversion of the Lokrians, we are told, to any new law, that the man who ventured to propose one appeared in public with a rope round his neck, which was at once tightened if he failed to convince the assembly of the necessity of his proposition.² Of the government of the Epizephyrian Lokri we know only that in later times it included a great council of 1000 members, and a chief executive magistrate called Kosmopolis; it is spoken of also as strictly and carefully administered.

The date of Rhegium (Reggio), separated from the territory of the Epizephyrian Lokri by the river Halex, must have been not only earlier than Lokri, but even earlier than Sybaris—if the statement of Antiochus be correct, that the colonists were joined by those Messenians, who, prior to the first Messenian war, were anxious to make reparation to the Spartans for the outrage offered to the Spartan maidens at the temple of Artemis Limnatis, but were overborne by their countrymen and forced into exile. A different version however is given by Pausanias of this migration of Messenians to Rhegium, yet still admitting the fact of such migration at the close of the first Messenian war, which would place the foundation of the city earlier than 720 B.C.—Though Rhegium was a Chalkidic colony, yet a portion of its inhabitants seem to have been undoubtedly of Messenian origin, and amongst them Anaxilas, despot of the town between 500-470 B.C., who traced his descent through two centuries to a

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 259; Skymnus Chius, v. 313; Cicero de Legg. ii. 6, and Epist. ad Atticum, vi. 1.

Heyne, Opuscula, vol. ii., Epimetrum ii. p. 60-68; Göller ad Timæi Fragment. pp. 220-259. Bentley (on the Epistles of Phalaris, ch. xii. p. 274) seems to countenance, without adequate reason, the doubt of Timæus about the existence of Zaleukus. But the statement of Ephorus, that Zaleukus had collected his ordinances from the Kretan, Lacedæmonian, and Areiopagitic customs, when contrasted with the simple and far more credible statement above-cited from

Aristotle, shows how loose were the affirmations respecting the Lokrian lawgiver (ap. Strabo. vi. p. 260). Other statements also concerning him, alluded to by Aristotle (Politic. ii. 9, 3), were distinctly at variance with chronology.

Charondas, the lawgiver of the Chalkidic towns in Italy and Sicily, as far as we can judge amidst much confusion of testimony, seems to belong to an age much later than Zaleukus: I shall speak of him hereafter.

² Dêmôsthen. cont. Timokrat. p. 744; Polyb. xii. 10.

Messenian emigrant named Alkidamidas.¹ The celebrity and power of Anaxilas, just at the time when the ancient history of the Greek towns was beginning to be set forth in prose and with some degree of system, caused the Messenian element in the population of Rhegium to be noticed prominently. But the town was essentially Chalkidic, connected by colonial sisterhood with the Chalkidic settlements in Sicily—Zanklê, Naxos, Katana, and Leontini. The original emigrants departed from Chalkis, as a tenth of the citizens consecrated by vow to Apollo in consequence of famine; and the directions of the god, as well as the invitation of the Zanklæans, guided their course to Rhegium. The town was flourishing, and acquired a considerable number of dependent villages around,² inhabited doubtless by cultivators of the indigenous population. But it seems to have been often at variance with the conterminous Lokrians, and received one severe defeat, in conjunction with the Tarentines, which will be hereafter recounted.

Chalkidic settlements in Italy and Sicily—
Rhegium, Zanklê, Naxos, Katana, Leontini.

Between Lokri and the Lakinian cape were situated the Achæan colony of Kaulônia, and Skyllêtium; the latter seemingly included in the domain of Krotôn, though pretending to have been originally founded by Menestheus, the leader of the Athenians at the siege of Troy: Petilia, also, a hill-fortress north-west of the Lakinian cape, as well as Makalla, both comprised in the territory of Krotôn, were affirmed to have been founded by Philoktêtês. Along all this coast of the Gulf of Tarentum, there were various establishments ascribed to the heroes of the Trojan war³—Epeius, Philoktêtês, Nestor—or to their returning troops. Of these establishments, probably the occupants had been small, miscellaneous, unacknowledged bands of Grecian adventurers,⁴ who assumed to themselves the most honourable origin which they could imagine, and who became afterwards absorbed into the larger colonial establishments which followed; the latter adopting and taking upon themselves the heroic worship of Philoktêtês or other warriors from Troy, which the prior emigrants had begun.

Kaulônia and Skyllêtium.

During the flourishing times of Sybaris and Krotôn, it seems that these two great cities divided the whole length of the coast of

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 257; Pausan. iv. 23, 2.

² Strabo, vi. p. 258. Ἰσχυσε δὲ μάλιστα ἡ τῶν Ῥηγινῶν πόλις, καὶ περιουκίδας ἔσχε συχναὶ, &c.

³ Strabo, vi. p. 263; Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. c. 106; Athenæ. xii. p. 523. It

is to these reputed Rhodian companions of Tlêpolemus before Troy, that the allusion in Strabo refers, to Rhodian occupants near Sybaris (xiv. p. 655).

⁴ See Mannert, Geographie, part ix. b. 9. ch. 11. p. 234.

the Tarentine Gulf, from the spot now called Rocca Imperiale down to the south of the Lakinian cape. Between the point where the dominion of Sybaris terminated on the Tarentine side, and Tarentum itself, there were two considerable Grecian settlements

Siris or Herakleia. —Siris, afterwards called Herakleia and Metapontium. The fertility and attraction of the territory of Siris, with its two rivers, Akiris and Siris, were well-known even to the poet Archilochus¹ (660 B.C.), but we do not know the date at which it passed from the indigenous Chônians or Chaonians into the hands of Greek settlers. A citizen of Siris is mentioned among the suitors for the daughter of the Sikyonian Kleisthenês (580-560 B.C.). We are told that some Kolophonian fugitives, emigrating to escape the dominion of the Lydian kings, attacked and possessed themselves of the spot, giving to it the name Polieion. The Chônians of Siris ascribed to themselves a Trojan origin, exhibiting a wooden image of the Ilian Athênê, which they affirmed to have been brought away by their fugitive ancestors after the capture of Troy. When the town was stormed by the Ionians, many of the inhabitants clung to this relic for protection, but were dragged away and slain by the victors,² whose sacrilege was supposed to have been the cause that their settlement was not durable. At the time of the invasion of Greece by Xerxês, the fertile territory of Siritis was considered as still open to be colonised; for the Athenians, when their affairs appeared desperate, had this scheme of emigration in reserve as a possible resource;³ and there were inspired declarations from some of the contemporary prophets which encouraged them to undertake it. At length, after the town of Thurii had been founded by Athens, in the vicinity of the dismantled Sybaris, the Thurians tried to possess themselves of the Siritid territory, but were opposed by the Tarentines.⁴ According to the compromise concluded between them, Tarentum was recognised as the metropolis of the colony, but joint possession was allowed both to Tarentines and Thurians. The former transferred the site of the city, under the new name

¹ Archiloch. Fragm. 17, ed. Schneidewin.

² Herodot. vi. 127; Strabo, vi. p. 263. The name Polieion seems to be read Παιϊον in Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. 106.

Niebuhr assigns this Kolophonian settlement of Siris to the reign of Gygês in Lydia; for which I know no other evidence except the statement that Gygês took τῶν Κολοφωνίων τὸ ἄστυ (Herodot.

i. 14); but this is no proof that the inhabitants then emigrated; for Kolophôn was a very flourishing and prosperous city afterwards.

Justin (xx. 2) gives a case of sacrilegious massacre committed near the statue of Athênê at Siris, which appears to be totally different from the tale respecting the Kolophonians.

³ Herodot. viii. 62.

⁴ Strabo, vi. p. 264.

Herakleia, to a spot three miles from the sea, leaving Siris as the place of maritime access to it.¹

About twenty-five miles eastward of Siris on the coast of the Tarentine Gulf was situated Metapontium, a Greek town which was affirmed by some to draw its origin from the Pylian companions of Nestor—by others, from the Phokian warriors of Epeius, on their return from Troy. The proofs of the former were exhibited in the worship of the Neleid heroes,—the proofs of the latter in the preservation of the reputed identical tools with which Epeius had constructed the Trojan horse.² Metapontium was planted on the territory of the Chônians or Cēnotrians, but the first colony is said to have been destroyed by an attack of the Samnites,³ at what period we do not know. It had been founded by some Achæan settlers—under the direction of the œkist Daulius, despot of the Phokian Krissa, and invited by the inhabitants of Sybaris—who feared that the place might be appropriated by the neighbouring Tarentines, colonists from Sparta and hereditary enemies in Peloponnesus of the Achæan race. Before the new settlers arrived, however, the place seems to have been already appropriated by the Tarentines; for the Achæan Leukippus only obtained their permission to land by a fraudulent promise, and after all had to sustain a forcible struggle both with them and with the neighbouring Cēnotrians, which was compromised by a division of territory. The fertility of the Metapontine territory was hardly less celebrated than that of the Siritid.⁴

Farther eastward of Metapontium, again at the distance of about twenty-five miles, was situated the great city of Taras or Tarentum, a colony from Sparta founded after the first Messenian war, seemingly about 707 B.C. The œkist Phalanthus, said to have been an Herakleid, was placed at

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 264.

² Strabo, *l. c.*; Justin, xx. 2; Vel-leius Paterc. i. 1; Aristot. Mirab. Auscult. c. 108. This story respecting the presence and implements of Epeius may have arisen through the Phocian settlers from Krissa.

³ The words of Strabo—*ἡφανίσθη δ' ὑπὸ Σαυνιτῶν* (vi. p. 264) can hardly be connected with the immediately following narrative which he gives out of Antiochus, respecting the revival of the place by new Achæan settlers, invited by the Achæans of Sybaris. For the latter place was reduced to impotence in 510 B.C.: invitations by the Achæans of Sybaris must therefore be anterior to that date. If Daulius despot of Krissa

is to be admitted as the œkist of Metapontium, the plantation of it must be placed early in the first half of the sixth century B.C.; but there is great difficulty in admitting the extension of Samnite conquests to the Gulf of Tarentum at so early a period as this. I therefore construe the words of Antiochus as referring to the original settlement of Metapontium by the Greeks, not to the revival of the town after its destruction by the Samnites.

⁴ Strabo, *l. c.*; Stephanus Byz. (v. *Μεταπόντιον*) identifies Metapontium and Siris in a perplexing manner.

Livy (xxv. 15) recognises Metapontium as Achæan: compare Heyne, *Opuscula*, vol. ii., Prolus. xii. p. 207.

the head of a body of Spartan emigrants—consisting principally of some citizens called Epeunaktæ and of the youth called Partheniæ, who had been disgraced by their countrymen on account of their origin and were on the point of breaking out into rebellion. It was out of the Messenian war that this emigration is stated to have arisen, in a manner analogous to that which has been stated respecting the Epizephyrian Lokrians. The Lacedæmonians, before entering Messenia to carry on the war, had made a vow not to return until they should have completed the conquest; a vow in which it appears that some of them declined to take part, standing altogether aloof from the expedition. When the absent soldiers returned after many years of absence consumed in the war, they found a numerous progeny which had been born to their wives and daughters during the interval, from intercourse with those (Epeunaktæ) who had staid at home. The Epeunaktæ were punished by being degraded to the rank and servitude of Helots;

The Par-
theniæ—
Phalanthus
the ægist.

the children thus born, called Partheniæ,¹ were also cut off from all the rights of citizenship, and held in dishonour. But the parties punished were numerous enough to make themselves formidable, and a conspiracy was planned among them intended to break out at the great religious festival of the Hyakinthia, in the temple of the Amyklæan Apollo. Phalanthus was the secret chief of the conspirators, who agreed to commence their attack upon the authorities at the moment when he should put on his helmet. The leader, however, never intending that the scheme should be executed, betrayed it beforehand, stipulating for the safety of all those implicated in it. At the commencement of the festival, when the multitude were already assembled, a herald was directed to proclaim aloud that Phalanthus would not on that day put on his helmet—a proclamation which at once revealed to the conspirators that they were betrayed. Some of them sought safety in flight, others assumed the posture of suppliants; but they were merely detained in confinement, with assurance of safety, while Phalanthus was sent to the Delphian oracle to ask advice respecting emigration. He is said to have inquired whether he might be permitted to appropriate the fertile plain of Sikyon, but the Pythian priestess emphatically dissuaded him, and enjoined him to conduct his emigrants to Satyrium and

¹ Partheniæ, *i. e.* children of virgins: the description given by Varro of the Illyrian *virgines* illustrates this phrase:—"Quas *virgines* ibi appellant, nonnuncquam annorum xx, quibus mos eorum

non denegavit, ante nuptias ut succumberent quibus vellent, et incomitatis ut vagari liceret, et *liberos habere*." (Varro, De Re Rusticâ, ii. 10, 9.)

Tarentum, where he would be “a mischief to the Iapygians.” Phalanthus obeyed, and conducted the detected conspirators as emigrants to the Tarentine Gulf,¹ which he reached a few years after the foundation of Sybaris and Krotôn by the Achæans. According to Ephorus, he found these prior emigrants at war with the natives, aided them in the contest, and received in return their aid to accomplish his own settlement. But this can hardly have consisted with the narrative of Antiochus, who represented the Achæans of Sybaris as retaining even in their colonies the hatred against the Dorian name which they had contracted in Peloponnesus.² Antiochus stated that Phalanthus and his colonists were received in a friendly manner by the indigenous inhabitants and allowed to establish their new town in tranquillity.

If such was really the fact, it proves that the native inhabitants of the soil must have been of purely inland habits, making no use of the sea either for commerce or for fishery, otherwise they would hardly have relinquished such a site as that of Tarentum—which, while favourable and productive even in regard to the adjoining land, was with respect to sea-advantages without a parallel in Grecian Italy.³ It was the only spot in the Gulf which possessed a perfectly safe and convenient harbour. A spacious inlet of the sea is there formed, sheltered by an isthmus and an outlying peninsula so as to leave only a narrow entrance. This inlet, still known as the Mare Piccolo, though its shores and the adjoining tongue of land appear to have undergone much change, affords at the present day a constant, inexhaustible, and varied supply of fish, especially of shell-fish; which furnish both nourishment and employment to a large proportion among the inhabitants of the contracted modern Taranto, just as they once served the same purpose to the numerous, lively, and jovial population of the mighty Tarentum. The concentrated population of fishermen formed a predominant element in the character of the

¹ For this story respecting the foundation of Tarentum, see Strabo, vi. p. 278–280 (who gives the versions both of Antiochus and Ephorus); Justin, iii. 4; Diodorus, xv. 66; Excerpta Vatican. lib. vii.-x., ed. Maii, Fr. 12; Servius ad Virgil. *Æneid.* iii. 551.

There are several points of difference between Antiochus, Ephorus and Servius; the story given in the text follows the former.

The statement of Hesychius (v. Παρθενίαι) seems on the whole somewhat more intelligible than that given by

Strabo—Οἱ κατὰ τὸν Μεσσηνιακὸν πόλεμον αὐτοῖς γενόμενοι ἐκ τῶν θεραπαίνων καὶ οἱ ἐξ ἀνεκδότου λάβρα γεννόμενοι παῖδες. Justin translates Partheniæ, *Spartii*.

The local eponymous heroes Taras and Satyrus (from Satyrium) were celebrated and worshipped among the Tarentines. See Cicero, *Verr.* iv. 60, 13; Servius ad Virg. *Georg.* ii. 197; Zumpt. ap. Orelli, *Onomasticon Tullian.* ii. p. 570.

² Compare Strabo, vi. p. 264 and p. 280.

³ Strabo, vi. p. 278; Polyb. x. 1,

Tarentine democracy.¹ Tarentum was just on the borders of the country originally known as Italy, within which Herodotus includes it, while Antiochus considers it in Iapygia, and regards Metapontium as the last Greek town in Italy.

Its immediate neighbours were the Iapygians, who, under various subdivisions of name and dialect, seem to have occupied the greater part of south-eastern Italy, including the peninsula denominated after them (yet sometimes also called the Salentine), between the Adriatic and the Tarentine Gulf,—and who are even stated at one time to have occupied some territory on the south-east of that Gulf, near the site of Krotôn. The Iapygian name appears to have comprehended Messapians, Salentines, and Kalabrians; according to some even Peuketians and Daunians, as far along the Adriatic as Mount Garganus or Drion: Skylax notices in his time (about 360 B.C.) five different tongues in the country which he calls Iapygia.² The Messapians and

¹ Juvenal, Sat. vi. 297. "Atque coronatum et petulans madidumque Tarentum;" compare Plato, Legg. i. p. 637; and Horat. Satir. ii. 4, 34. Aristot. Polit. iv. 4, 1. οἱ ἄλλοις ἐν Τάραντι καὶ Βυζαντίῳ. "Tarentina ostrea," Varro, Fragm. p. 301, ed. Bipont.

To illustrate this remark of Aristotle on the fishermen of Tarentum as the predominant class in the democracy, I transcribe a passage from Mr. Keppel Craven's Tour in the Southern Provinces of Naples, ch. x. p. 182:—"Swinburne gives a list of ninety-three different sorts of shell-fish which are found in the Gulf of Taranto; but more especially in the Mare Piccolo. Among these, in ancient times, the murex and purpura ranked foremost in value; in our degenerate days the muscle and oyster seem to have usurped a pre-eminence as acknowledged but less dignified; but there are numerous other tribes held in proportionate estimation for their exquisite flavour, and as greedily sought for during their respective seasons. The appetite for shell-fish of all sorts, which seems peculiar to the natives of these regions, is such as to appear exaggerated to a foreigner, accustomed to consider only a few of them as eatable. This taste exists at Taranto, if possible, in a stronger degree than in any other part of the kingdom, and accounts for the comparatively large revenue which government draws from this particular branch of commerce. The Mare Piccolo is divided

into several portions, which are let to different societies, who thereby become the only privileged fishermen; the lower classes are almost all employed by these corporations, as every revolving season of the year affords occupation for them, so that nature herself seems to have afforded the exclusive trade most suited to the inhabitants of Taranto. Both seas abound with varieties of testacea, but the inner gulf (the Mare Piccolo) is esteemed most favourable to their growth and flavour; the sandy bed is literally blackened by the muscles that cover it; the boats that glide over its surface are laden with them; they emboss the rocks that border the strand, and appear equally abundant on the shore, piled up in heaps." Mr. Craven goes on to illustrate still farther the wonderful abundance of this fishery; but that which has been already transcribed, while it illustrates the above-noticed remark of Aristotle, will at the same time help to explain the prosperity and physical abundance of the ancient Tarentum.

For an elaborate account of the state of cultivation, especially of the olive, near the degenerate modern Taranto, see the Travels of M. de Salis Marschallins in the Kingdom of Naples (translated by Aufrere, London, 1795), sect. 5. pp. 82-107, 163-178.

² Skylax does not mention at all the name of Italy; he gives to the whole coast, from Rhegium to Poseidonia on the Mediterranean, and from the same

Salentines are spoken of as immigrants from Krête, akin to the Minoian or primitive Kretans; and we find a national genealogy which recognises Iapyx son of Dædalus, an immigrant from Sicily. But the story told to Herodotus was, that the Kretan soldiers who had accompanied Minos in his expedition to recover Dædalus from Kamikus in Sicily, were on their return home cast away on the shores of Iapygia, and became the founders of Hyria and other Messapian towns in the interior of the country.¹ Brundisium also, or Brentesion as the Greeks called it,² inconsiderable in the days of Herodotus, but famous in the Roman times afterwards as the most frequented sea-port for voyaging to Epirus, was a Messapian town. The native language spoken by the Iapygian Messapians was a variety of the Oscan: the Latin poet ^{Messapians.} Ennius, a native of Rudia in the Iapygian peninsula, spoke Greek, Latin, and Oscan, and even deduced his pedigree from the ancient national prince or hero Messapus.³

We are told that during the lifetime of Phalanthus, the Tarentine settlers gained victories over the Messapians and Peuketians, which they commemorated afterwards by votive offerings at Delphi—and that they even made acquisitions at the expense of the inhabitants of Brundisium⁴—a statement difficult to believe, if we look to the distance of the latter place, and to the circumstance that Herodotus even in his time names it only as a harbour. Phalanthus too, driven into exile, is said to have found a hospitable reception at Brundisium and to have died there. Of the history of Tarentum, however, during the first 230 years of its existence, we possess no details. We have reason to believe that it partook in the general prosperity of the Italian Greeks during those two centuries, though remaining inferior both to Sybaris and to Krotôn. About the year 510 B.C., these two latter republics went to war, and Sybaris was nearly destroyed; while in the subsequent half-century the Krotoniates suffered the terrible defeat of Sagra from the Lokrians, and the Tarentines experienced an equally ruinous

point to the limit between Thurii and Herakleia on the Gulf of Tarentum, the name of Lucania (c. 12, 13). From this point he extends Iapygia to the Mount Drion or Garganus, so that he includes not only Metapontium, but also Herakleia in Iapygia.

Antiochus draws the line between Italy and Iapygia at the extremity of the Metapontine territory; comprehending Metapontium in Italy, and Tarentum in Iapygia (Antiochus, Frag. 6, ed. Didot; ap. Strabo. vi. p. 254).

Herodotus however speaks not only of Metapontium, but also of Tarentum, as being in Italy (i. 24; iii. 136; iv. 15).

¹ Herodot. vii. 170; Pliny, H. N. iii. 16; Athenæ. xii. p. 523; Servius ad Virgil. *Æneid.* viii. 9.

² Herodot. iv. 99.

³ Servius ad Virgil. *Æneid.* vii. 691. Polybius distinguishes Iapygians from Messapians (ii. 24).

⁴ Pausanias, x. 10, 3; x. 13, 5; Strabo, vii. p. 282; Justin, iii. 4.

defeat from the Iapygian Messapians. From these reverses, however, the Tarentines appear to have recovered more completely than the Krotoniates; for the former stand first among the Italiots or Italian Greeks, from the year 400 B.C. down to the supremacy of the Romans, and made better head against the growth of the Lucanians and Bruttians of the interior.

Such were the chief cities of the Italian Greeks from Tarentum on the upper sea to Poseidonia on the lower; and if we take them during the period preceding the ruin of Sybaris (in 510 B.C.), they will appear to have enjoyed a degree of prosperity even surpassing that of the Sicilian Greeks. The dominion of Sybaris, Krotôn, and Lokri extended across the peninsula from sea to sea. The mountainous regions of the interior of Calabria were held in amicable connexion with the cities and cultivators in the plain and valley near the sea—to the reciprocal advantage of both. The petty native tribes of Cœnotrians, Sikels, or Italians properly so-called, were partially hellenised, and brought into the condition of village cultivators and shepherds dependent upon Sybaris and its fellow-cities; a portion of them dwelling in the town, probably, as domestic slaves of the rich men, but most of them remaining in the country region as serfs, Penestæ, or coloni, intermingled with Greek settlers, and paying over parts of their produce to Greek proprietors.

But this dependence, though accomplished in the first instance by force, was yet not upheld exclusively by force. It was to a great degree the result of an organised march of life, and of more productive cultivation brought within their reach—of new wants, both created and supplied—of temples, festivals, ships, walls, chariots, &c., which imposed upon the imagination of the rude landmen and shepherd. Against mere force the natives could have found shelter in the unconquerable forests and ravines of the Calabrian Apennines, and in that vast mountain region of the Sila, lying immediately behind the plains of Sybaris, where even the French army with its excellent organisation in 1807 found so much difficulty in reaching the bandit villagers.¹ It was not by arms alone, but by arms and arts combined—a mingled influence,

¹ See a description of the French military operations in these almost inaccessible regions, contained in a valuable publication by a French general officer, on service in that country for three years, 'Calabria during a military residence of three years,' London, 1832,

Letter xx. p. 201.

The whole picture of Calabria contained in this volume is both interesting and instructive: military operations had never before been carried on, probably, in the mountains of the Sila.

such as enabled imperial Rome to subdue the fierceness of the rude Germans and Britons—that the Sybarites and Krotoniates acquired and maintained their ascendancy over the natives of the interior. The shepherd of the banks of the river Sybaris or Krathis not only found a new exchangeable value for his cattle and other produce, becoming familiar with better diet and clothing and improved cultivation of the olive and the vine—but he was also enabled to display his prowess, if strong and brave, in the public games at the festival of the Lakinian Hêrê, or even at the Olympic games in Peloponnesus.¹ It is thus that we have to explain the extensive dominion, the great population, and the wealth and luxury of the Sybarites and Krotoniates—a population of which the incidental reports as given in figures are not trustworthy, but which we may well believe to have been very numerous. The native Enotrians, while unable to combine in resisting Greek force, were at the same time less widely distinguished from the Greeks in race and language, than the Oscans of Middle Italy, and therefore more accessible to Greek pacific influences; while the Oscan race seem to have been both fiercer in repelling the assaults of the Greeks, and more intractable as to their seductions. The Iapygians were not modified by the neighbourhood of Tarentum in the same degree as the tribes adjoining to Sybaris and Krotôn by their contact with those cities. The dialect of Tarentum,² as well as of Herakleia, though a marked Doric, admitted many local peculiarities; and the farces of the Tarentine poet Rhinthon, like the Syracusan Sophron, seem to have blended the Hellenic with the Italic in language as well as in character.

About the year 560 B.C., the time of the accession of Peisistratus at Athens, the close of what may properly be called the first period of Grecian history, Sybaris and Krotôn were at the maximum of their power, which each maintained for half a century afterwards, until the fatal dissension between them. We are told that the Sybarites in that final contest marched against Krotôn with an army of 300,000 men. Fabulous as this number doubtless is, we cannot doubt that for an irruption of this kind into an adjoining territory, their large body of semi-hellenised

Ascendancy
over the
Enotrian
population.

Krotôn and
Sybaris—at
their maxi-
mum from
560-510 B.C.

¹ See Theokritos, Idyll. iv. 6-35, which illustrates the point here stated.

² Suidas, v. 'Πινθων; Stephan. Byz. v. Τάρας: compare Bernhardt, Grundriss der Römischen Litteratur, Abschnitt ii. pt. 2. p. 185, 186, about the analogy of these φλύακες of Rhinthon with the

native Italic Mimes.

The dialect of the other cities of Italic Greece is very little known: the ancient Inscription of Betilia is Doric: see Ahrens, De Dialecto Doricâ, sect. 49. p. 418.

native subjects might be mustered in prodigious force. The few statements which have reached us respecting them, touch, unfortunately, upon little more than their luxury, fantastic self-indulgence, and extravagant indolence, for which qualities they have become proverbial in modern times as well as in ancient. Anecdotes illustrating these qualities were current, and served more than one purpose in antiquity. The philosopher recounted them in order to discredit and denounce the character which they exemplified: while among gay companies, "Sybaritic tales," or tales respecting sayings and doings of ancient Sybarites, formed a separate and special class of excellent stories to be told simply for amusement¹—with which view witty romancers multiplied them indefinitely. It is probable that the Pythagorean philosophers (who belonged originally to Krotôn, but maintained themselves permanently as a philosophical sect in Italy and Sicily, with a strong tinge of ostentatious asceticism and mysticism), in their exhortations to temperance and in their denunciations of luxurious habits, might select by preference examples from Sybaris, the ancient enemy of the Krotoniates, to point their moral; and that the exaggerated reputation of the city thus first became the subject of common talk throughout the Grecian world. For little could be actually known of Sybaris in detail, since its humiliation dates from the first commencement of Grecian contemporaneous history. Hekataëus of Milêtus may perhaps have visited it in its full splendour, but even Herodotus knew it only by past report; and the principal anecdotes respecting it are cited from authors considerably later than him, who follow the tone of thought so common in antiquity, in ascribing the ruin of the Sybarites to their overweening corruption and luxury.²

¹ Aristoph. Vesp. 1260. *Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον, ἢ Συβαριτικόν*. What is meant by *Συβαριτικὸν γελοῖον* is badly explained by the Scholiast, but is perfectly well illustrated by Aristophanês himself in subsequent verses of the same play (1427-1436), where Philokleon tells two good stories respecting "a Sybaritan man," and a "woman in Sybaris:" *Ἄνὴρ Συβαρίτης ἐξέπεσεν ἐξ ἄρματος, &c. — ἐν Συβάρει γυνή ποτε Κατέαξ' ἐχίνον, &c.*

These *Συβάρια ἐπιφθέγματα* are as old as Epicharmus, whose mind was much imbued with the Pythagorean philosophy. See Etymolog. Magn. *Συβαρίζειν*. Ælian amused himself also with the *ἱστορίαι Συβαριτικαί* (V. H. xiv. 20): compare Hesychius, *Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι*,

and Suidas, *Συβαριτικάις*.

² Thus Herodotus (vi. 127) informs us that at the time when Kleisthenês of Sikyon invited from all Greece suitors of proper dignity for the hand of his daughter, Smindyridês of Sybaris came among the number, "the most delicate and luxurious man ever known" (*ἐπὶ πλεῖστον δὴ χλιδῆς εἰς ἀνὴρ ἀφίκετο*—Herodot. vi. 127), and Sybaris was at that time (B.C. 580-560) in its greatest prosperity. In Chamæleon, Timæus, and other writers subsequent to Aristotle, greater details were given. Smindyridês was said to have taken with him to the marriage 1000 domestic servants, fishermen, bird-catchers, and cooks (Athenæ. vi. 271; xii. 541). The details of Sybaritic luxury, given in Athe-

Making allowance, however, for exaggeration on all these accounts, there can be no reason to doubt that Sybaris, in 560 B.C., was one of the most wealthy, populous, and powerful cities of the Hellenic name; and that it also presented both comfortable abundance among the mass of the citizens, arising from the easy attainment of fresh lots of fertile land, and excessive indulgences among the rich—to a degree forming marked contrast with Hellas Proper, of which Herodotus characterised Poverty as the foster-sister.¹ The extraordinary productiveness of the neighbouring territory—alleged by Varro, in his time, when the culture must have been much worse than it had been under the old Sybaris, to yield an ordinary crop of a hundred-fold,² and extolled by modern travellers even in its present yet more neglected culture—has been already touched upon. The river Krathis—still the most considerable river of that region—at a time when there was an industrious population to keep its water-course in order, would enable the extensive fields of Sybaris to supply abundant nourishment for a population larger perhaps than any other Grecian city could parallel. But though nature was thus bountiful, industry, good management, and well-ordered govern-

The Sybarites—their luxury—their organisation, industry, and power.

næus, are chiefly borrowed from writers of this post-Aristotelian age—Heraclides of Pontus, Phylarchus, Klearchus, Timæus (Athenæ. xii. 519–522). The best-authenticated of all the examples of Sybaritic wealth is the splendid figured garment, fifteen cubits in length, which Alkimenès the Sybarite dedicated as a votive offering in the temple of the Lakinian Hêrê. Dionysius of Syracuse plundered that temple, got possession of the garment, and is said to have sold it to the Carthaginians for the price of 120 talents: Polemon the Periegetes seems to have seen it at Carthage (Aristot. Mirab. Ausc. 96; Athenæ. xii. 541). Whether the price be correctly stated, we are not in a situation to determine.

¹ Herodot. vii. 102. τῇ Ἑλλάδι πενίη μὲν αἰεὶ κοτε συντροφὸς ἐστί.

² Varro, De Re Rusticâ, i. 44. "In Sybaritano dicunt etiam cum centesimo redire solitum." The land of the Italic Greeks stands first for wheat bread and beef; that of Syracuse for pork and cheese (Hermippus ap. Athenæ. i. p. 27): about the excellent wheat of Italy, compare Sophoklès, Triptolein. Frag. 529, ed. Dindorf.

Theophrastus dwells upon the excellence of the land near Mylæ, in the

territory of the Sicilian Messênê, which produced (according to him) thirty-fold (Hist. Plant. ix. 2, 8, p. 259, ed. Schneid.). This affords some measure of comparison both for the real excellence of the ancient Sybaritan territory, and for the estimation in which it was held: its estimated produce being more than three times that of Mylæ.

See in Mr. Keppel Craven's Tour in the Southern Provinces of Naples (chapters xi. xii. pp. 212–218), the description of the rich and productive plain of the Krathis (in the midst of which stood the ancient Sybaris), extending about sixteen miles from Cassano to Corigliano, and about twelve miles from the former town to the sea. Compare also the picture of the same country in the work by a French officer referred to in a previous note, 'Calabria during a military residence of three years,' London, 1832, Letter xxii. p. 219–226.

Hekateus (c. 39, ed. Klausen) calls Cosa—Κόσσα, πόλις Οἰνωτρῶν ἐν μεσσηνίᾳ. Cosa is considered to be identical, seemingly on good grounds, with the modern Cassano (Cæsar, Bell. Civ. iii. 22): assuming this to be correct, there must have been an Enotrian dependent town within eight miles of the ancient city of Sybaris.

ment were required to turn her bounty to account: where these are wanting, later experience of the same territory shows that its inexhaustible capacities may exist in vain. That luxury, which Grecian moralists denounced in the leading Sybarites between 560 and 510 B.C., was the result of acquisitions vigorously and industriously pushed, and kept together by an orderly central force, during a century and a half that the colony had existed. Though the Trœzenian settlers who formed a portion of the original emigrants had been expelled when the Achæans became more numerous, yet we are told that, on the whole, Sybaris was liberal in the reception of new immigrants to the citizenship,¹ and that this was one of the causes of its remarkable advance. Of these additional comers we may presume that many went to form its colonies on the Mediterranean Sea, and some to settle both among its four dependent inland nations and its twenty-five subject towns. Five thousand horsemen, we are told, clothed in showy attire, formed the processional march in certain Sybaritic festivals—a number which is best appreciated by comparison with the fact, that the knights or horsemen of Athens in her best days did not exceed 1200. The Sybaritic horses, if we are to believe a story purporting to come from Aristotle, were taught to move to the sound of the flute; and the garments of these wealthy citizens were composed of the finest wool from Milêtus in Ionia²—the Tarentine wool not having then acquired the distinguished renown which it possessed five centuries afterwards towards the close of the Roman republic. Next to the great abundance of home produce—corn, wine, oil, flax, cattle, fish, timber, &c.—the fact next in importance, which we hear respecting Sybaris is, the great traffic carried on with Milêtus: these two cities were more intimately and affectionately connected together than any two Hellenic cities within the knowledge of Herodotus.³ The tie between Tarentum and Knidus was also of a very intimate character,⁴ so that the great intercourse, personal as well as commercial, between the Asiatic and the Italic Greeks, appears as a marked fact in the history of the sixth century before the Christian æra.

In this respect, as well as in several others, the Hellenic world wears a very different aspect in 560 B.C. from that which it assumed a century afterwards, and in which it is best known to mo-

¹ Diodor. xii. 9.

² Athenæus, xii. p. 519.

³ Herodot. vi. 21. Respecting the great abundance of ship-timber in the territory of the Italiots (Italic Greeks),

see Thucyd. vi. 90; vii. 25.

The pitch from the pine forests in the Sila was also abundant and celebrated (Strabo, vi. p. 261).

⁴ Herodot. iii. 138.

dern readers. At the former period, the Ionic and Italic Greeks are the great ornaments of the Hellenic name, carrying on a more lucrative trade with each other than either of them maintained with Greece Proper; which both of them recognised as their mother-country; though without admitting anything in the nature of established headship. The military power of Sparta is indeed at this time great and preponderant in Peloponnesus, but she has no navy, and she is only just essaying her strength, not without reluctance, in ultra-marine interference. After the lapse of a century, these circumstances change materially. The independence of the Asiatic Greeks is destroyed, and the power of the Italic Greeks is greatly broken; while Sparta and Athens not only become the prominent and leading Hellenic states, but constitute themselves centres of action for the lesser cities to a degree previously unknown.

Grecian world about 560 B.C. Ionic and Italic Greeks are then the most prominent among Greeks.

It was during the height of their prosperity, seemingly, in the sixth century B.C., that the Italic Greeks either acquired for, or bestowed upon, their territory the appellation of Magna Græcia, which at that time it well deserved; for not only were Sybaris and Krotôn then the greatest Grecian cities situated near together, but the whole peninsula of Calabria may be considered as attached to the Grecian cities on the coast. The native Ænotrians and Sikels occupying the interior had become hellenised, or semi-hellenised with a mixture of Greeks among them—common subjects of these great cities. The whole extent of the Calabrian peninsula, within an imaginary straight line carried from Sybaris to Poseidonia, might then be fairly considered as Hellenic territory. Sybaris maintained much traffic with the Tuscan towns in the Mediterranean; so that the communication between Greece and Rome, across the Calabrian isthmus,¹ may perhaps have been easier during the time of the Roman kings (whose expulsion was nearly contemporaneous with the ruin of Sybaris) than it became afterwards during the first two centuries of the Roman republic. But all these relations underwent a complete change after the breaking up of the power of Sybaris in 510 B.C., and the gradual march of the Oscan population from Middle Italy towards the south. Cumæ was overwhelmed by the Samnites, Poseidonia by the Lucanians; who became possessed not only of these maritime cities, but also of the whole inland territory (now called the Basilicata, with part of the Hither Calabria) across from Poseidonia to the neighbourhood of the

Consequences of the fall of Sybaris.

¹ Athenæus, xii. p. 519.

Gulf of Tarentum : while the Bruttians—a mixture of outlying Lucanians with the Greco-Cenotrian population once subject to Sybaris, speaking both Greek and Oscan¹—became masters of the inland mountains in the Farther Calabria from Consentia nearly to the Sicilian strait. It was thus that the ruin of Sybaris, combined with the spread of the Lucanians and Bruttians, deprived the Italic Greeks of that inland territory which they had enjoyed in the sixth century B.C., and restricted them to the neighbourhood of the coast. To understand the extraordinary power and prosperity of Sybaris and Krotôn, in the sixth century B.C., when the whole of this inland territory was subject to them and before the rise of the Lucanians and Bruttians, and when the name *Magna Græcia* was first given—it is necessary to glance by contrast at these latter periods ; more especially since the same name still continued to be applied by the Romans to Italic Greece after the contraction of territory had rendered it less appropriate.

Of Krotôn at this early period of its power and prosperity we know even less than of Sybaris. It stood distinguished both for the number of its citizens who received prizes at the Olympic games, and for the excellence of its surgeons or physicians. And what may seem more surprising, if we consider the extreme present insalubrity of the site upon which it stood, it was in ancient times proverbially healthy,² which was not so much the case with the more fertile Sybaris. Respecting all these cities of Italic Greeks, the same remark is applicable as was before made in reference to the Sicilian Greeks—that the intermixture of the native population sensibly affected both their character and habits. We have no information respecting their government during this early period of prosperity, except that we find mention at Krotôn (as at the Epizephyrian Lokri) of a senate of 1000 members, yet not excluding occasionally the ecclesia or general assembly.³ Probably the steady increase of their dominion in the interior, and the facility of providing maintenance for new population, tended much to make their political systems, whatever they may have been, work in a satisfactory manner. The attempt of Pythagoras and his followers to constitute themselves a ruling faction as well as a philosophical sect, will be recounted in a subsequent chapter. The proceedings connected with that attempt will show that there was considerable analogy and sympathy between the various cities of Italian Greece, so as to render them

Krotoniates
—their salu-
brity,
strength,
success in
the Olympic
games, &c.

¹ Festus, v. *bilingues Brutates*.

² Strabo, vi. p. 262.

³ Jamblichus, *Vit. Pythagor.* c. 9. p. 33 ; c. 35. p. 210.

liable to be acted on by the same causes. But though the festivals of the Lakinian Hêrê, administered by the Krotoniates, formed from early times a common point of religious assemblage to all¹—yet the attempts to institute periodical meetings of deputies, for the express purpose of maintaining political harmony, did not begin until after the destruction of Sybaris, nor were they ever more than partially successful.

One other city, the most distant colony founded by Greeks in the western regions, yet remains to be mentioned; and we can do no more than mention it, since we have no facts to make up its history. Massalia, the modern Marseilles, was founded by the Ionic Phokæans in the 45th Olympiad, about ^{Massalia.} 597 B.C.,² at the time when Sybaris and Krotôn were near the maximum of their power—when the peninsula of Calabria was all Hellenic, and when Cumæ also had not yet been visited by those calamities which brought about its decline. So much Hellenism in the south of Italy doubtless facilitated the western progress of the adventurous Phokæan mariner. It would appear that Massalia was founded by amicable fusion of Phokæan colonists with the indigenous Gauls, if we may judge by the romantic legend of the Protiadæ, a Massaliotic family or gens existing in the time of Aristotle. Euxenus, a Phokæan merchant, had contracted friendly relations with Nanus, a native chief in the south of Gaul, and was invited to the festival in which the latter was about to celebrate the marriage of his daughter Petta. According to the custom of the country, the maiden was to choose for herself a husband among the guests by presenting him with a cup: through accident, or by preference, Petta presented it to Euxenus, and became his wife. Prôtis of Massalia, the offspring of this marriage, was the primitive ancestor and eponym of the Protiadæ. According to another story respecting the origin of the same gens, Prôtis was himself the Phokæan leader who married Gypsis, daughter of Nannus king of the Segobrigian Gauls.³

Of the history of Massalia we know little, nor does it appear to have been connected with the general movement of the Grecian

¹ Athenæus, xii. 541.

² This date depends upon Timæus (as quoted by Skymnus Chius, 210) and Solinûs; there seems no reason for distrusting it, though Thucydides (i. 13) and Isokratês (Archidamus, p. 316) seem to conceive Massalia as founded by the Phokæans about 60 years later, when Ionia was conquered by Harpagus (see Bruckner, *Historia Reip. Massiliensium*,

sect. 2. p. 9, and Raoul Rochette, *Histoire des Colonies Grecques*, vol. iii. pp. 405–413, who however puts the arrival of the Phokæans, in these regions and at Tartessus, much too early.

³ Aristotle, *Μασσαλιῶτων πολιτεία*, ap. Athenæum, xiii. p. 576; Justin, xliii.

3. Plutarch (Solon, c. 2) seems to follow the same story as Justin.

world. We learn generally that the Massaliots administered their affairs with discretion as well as with unanimity, and exhibited in their private habits an exemplary modesty—that although preserving alliance with the people of the interior, they were scrupulously vigilant in guarding their city against surprise, permitting no armed strangers to enter—that they introduced the culture of vines and olives, and gradually extended the Greek alphabet, language, and civilization among the neighbouring Gauls—that they not only possessed and fortified many positions along the coast of the Gulf of Lyons, but also founded five colonies along the eastern coast of Spain—that their government was oligarchical, consisting of a perpetual senate of 600 persons, yet admitting occasionally new members from without, and a small council of fifteen members—that the Delphinian Apollo and the Ephesian Artemis were their chief deities, planted as guardians of their outlying posts, and transmitted to their colonies.¹ Although it is common to represent a deliberate march and steady supremacy of the governing few, with contented obedience on the part of the many, as the characteristic of Dorian states, and mutability not less than disturbance as the prevalent tendency in Ionian—yet there is no Grecian community to whom the former attributes are more pointedly ascribed than the Ionic Massalia. The commerce of the Massaliots appears to have been extensive, and their armed maritime force sufficiently powerful to defend it against the aggressions of Carthage—their principal enemy in the western Mediterranean.

¹ Strabo, iv. p. 179–182; Justin, xliii. 4–5; Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 26. It rather appears from Aristotle (*Polit.* v. 5, 2; vi. 4–5) that the senate was originally a body completely close, which gave rise to discontent on the part of wealthy

men not included in it: a mitigation took place by admitting into it, occasionally, men selected from the latter.

Some authors seem to have accused the Massaliots of luxurious and effeminate habits (see Athenæus, xii. p. 523).

CHAPTER XXIII.

GRECIAN COLONIES IN AND NEAR EPIRUS.

ON the eastern side of the Ionian Sea were situated the Grecian colonies of Korkyra, Leukas, Anaktorium, Ambrakia, Apollonia, and Epidamnus.

Among these, by far the most distinguished, for situation, for wealth, and for power, was Korkyra—now known as Corfu, the same name belonging, as in antiquity, both to ^{Korkyra.} the town and the island, which is separated from the coast of Epirus by a strait varying from two to seven miles in breadth. Korkyra was founded by the Corinthians, at the same time (we are told) as Syracuse. Chersikratês, a Bacchiad, is said to have accompanied Archias on his voyage from Corinth to Syracuse, and to have been left with a company of emigrants on the island of Korkyra, where he founded a settlement.¹ What inhabitants he found there, or how they were dealt with, we cannot clearly make out. The island was generally conceived in antiquity as the residence of the Homeric Phæakians, and it is to this fact that Thucydides ascribes in part the eminence of the Korkyræan marine.² According to another story, some Eretrians from Eubœa had settled there, and were compelled to retire. A third statement represents the Liburnians³ as the prior inhabitants—and this perhaps is the most probable, since the Liburnians were an enterprising, maritime, piratical race, who long continued to occupy the more northerly islands in the Adriatic along the Illyrian and Dalmatian coast. That maritime activity, and number of ships both warlike and commercial, which we find at an early date among the Korkyræans, and in which they stand distinguished from the Italian and Sicilian Greeks, may be plausibly attributed to their partial fusion with pre-existing Liburnians; for the ante-Hellenic natives of Magna Græcia and Sicily (as has been already noticed) were as unpractised at sea as the Liburnians were expert.

¹ Strabo, vi. p. 269: compare Timæus, *Fragm.* 49, ed. Göller; *Fr.* 53, ed. Didot.

² Thucyd. i. 25.

³ Strabo, *l. c.*; Plutarch, *Quæst. Græc.* c. 11: a different fable in Conon, *Narrat.* 3, ap. Photium *Cod.* 86.

At the time when the Corinthians were about to colonize Sicily, it was natural that they should also wish to plant a settlement at Korkyra, which was a post of great importance for facilitating the voyage from Peloponnesus to Italy, and was farther convenient for traffic with Epirus, at that period altogether non-Hellenic. Their choice of a site was fully justified by the prosperity and power of the colony, which, however, though sometimes in combination with the mother-city, was more frequently alienated from her and hostile, and continued so throughout most part of the three centuries from 700-400 B.C.¹ Perhaps also Molykreia and Chalkis,² on the south-western coast of Ætolia, not far from the mouth of the Corinthian Gulf, may have been founded by Corinth at a date hardly less early than Korkyra.

It was at Corinth that the earliest improvements in Greek ship-building, and the first construction of the trireme or war-ship with a triple bank of oars, was introduced. It was probably from Corinth that this improvement passed to Korkyra, as it did to Samos. In early times, the Korkyræan navy was in a condition to cope with the Corinthian; and the most ancient naval battle known to Thucydides³ was one between these two states, in 664 B.C. As far as we can make out, it appears that Korkyra maintained her independence not only during the government of the Bacchiads at Corinth, but also throughout the long reign of the despot Kypselus, and a part of the reign of his son Periander. But towards the close of this latter reign, we find Korkyra subject to Corinth. The barbarous treatment inflicted by Periander, in revenge for the death of his son, upon 300 Korkyræan youths, has already been recounted in a former chapter.⁴ After the death of Periander, the island seems to have regained its independence, but we are left without any particulars respecting it from about 585 B.C. down to the period shortly preceding the invasion of Greece by Xerxes—nearly a century. At this later epoch the Korkyræans possessed a naval force hardly inferior to any state in Greece. The expulsion of the Kypselids from Corinth, and the re-establishment of the previous oligarchy or something like it, does not seem to have reconciled the Korkyræans to their mother-city. For it was immediately previous to the Peloponnesian war that the Corinthians preferred the bitterest complaints against them,⁵ of setting at nought those obligations

Early
foundation of
Korkyra
from Corinth.

Relations
of Korkyra
with Corinth.

¹ Herodot. iii. 49.

² Thucyd. i. 108; iii. 102.

³ Thucyd. i. 13.

⁴ Herodot. iii. 49-51; see above, chap. ix.

⁵ Thucyd. i. 25-37.

which a colony was generally understood to be obliged to render. No place of honour was reserved at the public festivals of Korkyra for Corinthian visitors, nor was it the practice to offer to the latter the first taste of the victims sacrificed—observances which were doubtless respectfully fulfilled at Ambrakia and Leukas. Nevertheless the Korkyræans had taken part conjointly with the Corinthians in favour of Syracuse, when that city was in imminent danger of being conquered and enslaved by Hippokratês¹ despot of Gela (about 492 B.C.)—an incident showing that they were not destitute of generous sympathy with sister states, and leading us to imagine that their alienation from Corinth was as much the fault of the mother-city as their own.

The grounds of the quarrel were, probably, jealousies of trade—especially trade with the Epirotic and Illyrian tribes, wherein both were to a great degree rivals. Safe at ^{Relations with Epirus.} home and industrious in the culture of their fertile island, the Korkyræans were able to furnish wine and oil to the Epirots on the main-land, in exchange for the cattle, sheep, hides and wool of the latter—more easily and cheaply than the Corinthian merchant. And for the purposes of this trade, they had possessed themselves of a Peræa or strip of the main-land immediately on the other side of the intervening strait, where they fortified various posts for the protection of their property.² The Corinthians were personally more popular among the Epirots than the Korkyræans;³ but it was not until long after the foundation of Korkyra that they established their first settlement on the main-land—Ambrakia, ^{Ambrakia founded by Corinth.} on the north side of the Ambrakiotic Gulf, near the mouth of the river Arachthus. It was during the reign of Kypselus, and under the guidance of his son Gorgus, that this settlement was planted, which afterwards became populous and considerable. We know nothing respecting its growth, and we hear only of a despot named Periander as ruling in it, probably related to the despot of the same name at Corinth.⁴ Periander of Ambrakia was overthrown by a private conspiracy, provoked by his own brutality and warmly seconded by the citizens, who lived constantly afterwards under a popular government.⁵

Notwithstanding the long-continued dissensions between Korkyra and Corinth, it appears that four considerable settlements

¹ Herodot. vii. 155.

² Thucyd. iii. 85. These fortifications are probably alluded to also i. 45–54.

³ ἡ ἐς τῶν ἐκείνων τι χαρίων.

⁴ Thucyd. i. 47.

⁴ Strabo, vii. p. 325, x. p. 452; Skymn. Chi. 453; Raoul Rochette, Hist. des Colon. Grecq. vol. iii. p. 294.

⁵ Aristot. Polit. v. 3, 5; v. 8, 9.

on this same line of coast were formed by the joint enterprise of both—Leukas and Anaktorium, to the south of the mouth of the Ambrakiotic Gulf—and Apollonia and Epidamnus, both in the territory of the Illyrians at some distance to the north of the Akrokeraunian promontory. In the settlement of the two latter, the Korkyræans seem to have been the principals—in that of the two former, they were only auxiliaries. It probably did not suit their policy to favour the establishment of any new colony on the intermediate coast opposite to their own island, between the promontory and the gulf above-mentioned. Leukas and Anaktorium. Leukas, Anaktorium, and Ambrakia, are all referred to the agency of Kypselus the Corinthian. The tranquillity which Aristotle ascribes to his reign may be in part ascribed to the new homes thus provided for poor or discontented Corinthian citizens. Leukas was situated near the modern Santa Maura: the present island was originally a peninsula, and continued to be so until the time of Thucydidês; but in the succeeding half-century, the Leukadians cut through the isthmus, and erected a bridge across the narrow strait connecting them with the main-land. It had been once an Akarnanian settlement, named Epileukadii, the inhabitants of which falling into civil dissension, invited 1000 Corinthian settlers to join them. The new-comers choosing their opportunity for attack, slew or expelled those who had invited them, made themselves masters of the place with its lands, and converted it from an Akarnanian village into a Grecian town.¹ Anaktorium was situated a short distance within the mouth of the Ambrakian Gulf—founded, like Leukas, upon Akarnanian soil and with a mixture of Akarnanian inhabitants, by colonists under the auspices of Kypselus or Periander. In both these establishments Korkyræan settlers participated;² in both also, the usual religious

¹ About Leukas, see Strabo, x. p. 452; Skylax, p. 34; Steph. Byz. v. *Ἐπὶ λευκάδιοι*.

Strabo seems to ascribe the cutting through of the isthmus to the original colonists. But Thucydidês speaks of this isthmus in the plainest manner (iii. 81), and of the Corinthian ships of war as being transported across it. The Dioryktos, or intervening factitious canal, was always shallow, only deep enough for boats, so that ships of war had still to be carried across by hand or machinery (Polyb. v. 5): both Plutarch (De Serâ Num. Vind. p. 552) and Pliny treat Leukadia as having again become a peninsula, from the accumulation of sand

(H. N. iv. 1): compare Livy, xxxiii. 17. Mannert (Geograph. der Gr. und Röm. Part viii. b. 1. p. 72) accepts the statement of Strabo, and thinks that the Dioryktos had already been dug before the time of Thucydidês. But it seems more reasonable to suppose that Strabo was misinformed as to the date, and that the cut took place at some time between the age of Thucydidês and that of Skylax.

Boeckh (ad Corp. Inscriptt. Gr. t. i. p. 58) and W. C. Müller (De Corcyræor. Republicâ, Götting. 1835, p. 18) agree with Mannert.

² Skymn. Chius, 458; Thucyd. i. 55; Plutarch, Themistoklês, c. 24.

feelings connected with Grecian emigration were displayed by the neighbourhood of a venerated temple of Apollo overlooking the sea—Apollo Aktius near Anaktorium, and Apollo Leukatas near Leukas.¹

Between these three settlements—Ambrakia, Anaktorium, and Leukas—and the Akarnanian population of the interior, there were standing feelings of hostility; perhaps arising out of the violence which had marked the first foundation of Leukas. The Corinthians, though popular with the Epirots, had been indifferent or unsuccessful in conciliating the Akarnanians. It rather seems indeed that the Akarnanians were averse to the presence or neighbourhood of any powerful sea-port; for in spite of their hatred towards the Ambrakiots, they were more apprehensive of seeing Ambrakia in the hands of the Athenians than in that of its own native citizens.²

The two colonies north of the Akrokeraunian promontory, and on the coast-land of the Illyrian tribes—Apollonia and Epidamnus—were formed chiefly by the Korkyræans, Apollonia and Epidamnus. yet with some aid and a portion of the settlers from Corinth, as well as from other Doric towns. Especially it is to be noticed, that the *œkist* was a Corinthian and a Herakleid, Phalius the son of Eratokleidês—for according to the usual practice of Greece, whenever a city, itself a colony, founded a sub-colony, the *œkist* of the latter was borrowed from the mother-city of the former.³ Hence the Corinthians acquired a partial right of control and interference in the affairs of Epidamnus, which we shall find hereafter leading to important practical consequences. Epidamnus (better known under its subsequent name Dyrrhachium) was situated on an isthmus on or near the territory of the Illyrian tribe called Taulantii, and is said to have been settled about 627 B.C. Apollonia, of which the god Apollo himself seems to have been recognised as *œkist*,⁴ was founded under similar circumstances, during the reign of Periander of Corinth, on a maritime plain both extensive and fertile, near the river Aôus, two days' journey south of Epidamnus.

¹ Thucyd. i. 46; Strabo, x. p. 452. Before 220 B.C., the temple of Apollo Aktius, which in the time of Thucydides belonged to Anaktorium, had come to belong to the Akarnanians; it seems also that the town itself had been merged in the Akarnanian league, for Polybius does not mention it separately (Polyb. iv. 63).

² Thucyd. iii. 94, 95, 115.

³ Thucyd. i. 24–26.

⁴ The rhetor Aristeidês pays a similar compliment to Kyzikus, in his Panegyric Address at that city—the god Apollo had founded it personally and directly himself, not through any human *œkist*, as was the case with other colonies (Aristeidês, *Λόγος περὶ Κυζίκου*, Or. xvi. p. 414; vol. i. p. 384, Dindorf).

Both the one and the other of these two cities seem to have flourished, and to have received accession of inhabitants from Triphylia in Peloponnesus, when that country was subdued by the Eleians. Respecting Epidamnus, especially, we are told that it acquired great wealth and population during the century preceding the Peloponnesian war.¹ A few allusions which we find in Aristotle, too brief to afford much instruction, lead us to suppose that the governments of both began by being close oligarchies under the management of the primitive leaders of the colony—that in Epidamnus, the artisans and tradesmen in the town were considered in the light of slaves belonging to the public—but that in process of time (seemingly somewhat before the Peloponnesian war) intestine dissensions broke up this oligarchy,² substituted a periodical senate, with occasional public assemblies, in place of the permanent phylarchs or chiefs of tribes, and thus introduced a form more or less democratical, yet still retaining the original single-headed archon. The Epidamnian government was liberal in the admission of metics or resident aliens—a fact which renders it probable that the alleged public slavery of artisans in that town was a status carrying with it none of the hardships of actual slavery. It was through an authorised selling agent, or *Polêtês*, that all traffic between Epidamnus and the neighbouring Illyrians was carried on—individual dealing with them being interdicted.³ Apollonia was in one respect pointedly distinguished from Epidamnus, since she excluded metics or resident strangers with a degree of rigour hardly inferior to Sparta. These few facts are all that we are permitted to hear respecting colonies both important in themselves and interesting as they brought the Greeks into connexion with distant people and regions.

The six colonies just named—Korkyra, Ambrakia, Anaktorium,

¹ Thucyd. i. 24. ἐγένετο μεγάλη καὶ πολυάνθρωπος; Strabo, vii. p. 316, viii. p. 357; Steph. Byz. v. Ἀπολλωνία; Plutarch, De Serâ Numin. Vind. p. 553; Pausan. v. 22, 2.

Respecting the plain near the site of the ancient Apollonia, Colonel Leake observes: "The cultivation of this noble plain, capable of supplying grain to all Illyria and Epirus, with an abundance of other productions, is confined to a few patches of maize near the villages" (Travels in Northern Greece, vol. i. ch. vii. p. 367). Compare c. ii. p. 70.

The country surrounding Durazzo

(the ancient Epidamnus) is described by another excellent observer as highly attractive, though now unhealthy. See the valuable topographical work, 'Albanien, Rumelien, und die Oesterreichisch-montenegrinische Gränze, von Dr. Joseph Müller (Prag. 1844), p. 62.

² Thucyd. i. 25; Aristot. Polit. iii. 4, 13; iii. 11, 1; iv. 3, 8; v. 1, 6; v. 3, 4. The allusions of the philosopher are so brief, as to convey little or no knowledge: see O. Müller, Dorians, b. iii. 9, 6; Tittmann, Griech. Staatsverfass. p. 491.

³ Plutarch, Quæst. Græc. p. 297, c. 29; Ælian, V. H. xiii. 16.

Leukas, Apollonia, and Epidamnus—form an aggregate lying apart from the rest of the Hellenic name and connected with each other, though not always maintained in harmony, by analogy of race and position, as well as by their common original from Corinth. That the commerce which the Corinthian merchants carried on with them, and through them with the tribes in the interior, was lucrative, we can have no doubt; and Leukas and Ambrakia continued for a long time to be not merely faithful allies, but servile imitators, of their mother-city. The commerce of Korkyra is also represented as very extensive, and carried even to the northern extremity of the Ionic Gulf. It would seem that they were the first Greeks to open a trade and to establish various settlements on the Illyrian and Dalmatian coasts, as the Phokæans were the first to carry their traffic along the Adriatic coast of Italy. The jars and pottery of Korkyra enjoyed great reputation throughout all parts of the Gulf.¹ The general trade of the island, and the encouragement for its shipping, must probably have been greater during the sixth century B.C., while the cities of Magna Græcia were at the maximum of their prosperity, than in the ensuing century when they had comparatively declined. Nor can we doubt that the visitors and presents to the oracle of Dodona in Epirus, which was distant two days' journey on landing from Korkyra, and the importance of which was most sensible during the earlier periods of Grecian history, contributed to swell the traffic of the Korkyræans.

Relations between these colonies.—Commerce.

It is worthy of notice that the monetary system established at Korkyra was thoroughly Grecian and Corinthian, graduated on the usual scale of obols, drachms, minæ, and talents, without including any of those native Italian or Sicilian elements which were adopted by the cities in Magna Græcia and Sicily. The type of the Corinthian coins seems also to have passed to those of Leukas and Ambrakia.²

Of the islands of Zakynthos and Kephallenia (Zante and Cephalonia) we hear very little: of Ithaka, so interesting from the story

¹ W. C. Müller, *De Cocyræor. Repub.* ch. 3. p. 60–63; Aristot. *Mirab. Ausc.* c. 104; Hesychius, v. *Κερκυραῖοι ἀμφορείς*; Herodot. i. 145.

The story given in the above passage of the Pseudo-Aristotle is to be taken in connection with the succeeding chapter of the same work (105), wherein the statement (largely credited in antiquity)

is given that the river Danube forked at a certain point of its course into two streams, one flowing into the Adriatic, the other into the Euxine.

² See the Inscriptions No. 1838 and No. 1845, in the collection of Boeckh, and Boeckh's *Metrologie*, vii. 8. p. 97. Respecting the Corinthian coinage our information is confused and imperfect.

of the Odyssey, we have no historical information at all. The inhabitants of Zakynthus were Achæans from Peloponnesus: Kephallenia was distributed among four separate city-governments.¹ Neither of these islands plays any part in Grecian history until the time of the maritime empire of Athens, after the Persian war.

¹ Thucyd. ii. 30-66.

CHAPTER XXIV.

AKARNANIANS.—EPIROTS.

SOME notice must be taken of those barbarous or non-Hellenic nations who formed the immediate neighbours of Hellas, west of the range of Pindus, and north of that range which connects Pindus with Olympus—as well as of those other tribes who, though lying more remote from Hellas proper, were yet brought into relations of traffic or hostility with the Hellenic colonies.

Between the Greeks and these foreign neighbours, the Akarnanians, of whom I have already spoken briefly in my preceding volume, form the proper link of transition. Akarnanians.

They occupied the territory between the river Achelôus, the Ionian Sea, and the Ambrakian Gulf: they were Greeks, and admitted as such to contend at the Pan-Hellenic games,¹ yet they were also closely connected with the Amphiloichi and Agræi, who were not Greeks. In manners, sentiments, and intelligence, they were half-Hellenic and half-Epirotic—like the Ætolians and the Ozolian Lokrians. Even down to the time of Thucydîdês, these nations were subdivided into numerous petty communities, lived in unfortified villages, were frequently in the habit of plundering each other, and never permitted themselves to be unarmed: in case of attack, they withdrew their families and their scanty stock, chiefly cattle, to the shelter of difficult mountains or marshes. They were for the most part light-armed, few among them being trained to the panoply of the Grecian hoplite; but they were both brave and skilful in their own mode of warfare, and the sling in the hands of the Akarnanian was a weapon of formidable efficiency.²

Notwithstanding this state of disunion and insecurity, however, the Akarnanians maintained a loose political league among themselves. A hill near the Amphilochian Argos, on the shores of the Ambrakian Gulf, had been fortified to serve as a judgement-seat or place of meeting for the settlement of disputes. And it seems that both Stratus and Cœniadæ had become fortified in some measure towards the commencement of the Peloponnesian war.

¹ See Aristot. *Fragm.* *περὶ Πολιτειῶν*, | *πολιτεία*.
ed. Neumann; *Fragm.* 2. *Ἀκαρνάνων* | ² Pollux. i. 150; Thucyd. ii. 81.

The former, the most considerable township in Akarnania, was situated on the Achelôus, rather high up its course—the latter was at the mouth of the river, and was rendered difficult of approach by its inundations.¹ Astakus, Solium, Palærus, and Alyzia, lay on or near the coast of the Ionian Sea, between Ceniadæ and Leukas: Phytia, Koronta, Medeôn, Limnæa and Thyrium, were between the southern shore of the Ambrakian Gulf and the river Achelôus.

The Akarnanians appear to have produced many prophets. Their social and political condition. They traced up their mythical ancestry, as well as that of their neighbours the Amphilochians, to the most renowned prophetic family among the Grecian heroes—Amphiaraus, with his sons Alkmæôn and Amphilochus: Akarnan, the eponymous hero of the nation, and other eponymous heroes of the separate towns, were supposed to be the sons of Alkmæôn.² They are spoken of, together with the Ætolians, as mere rude shepherds by the lyric poet Alkman, and so they seem to have continued with little alteration until the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, when we hear of them, for the first time, as allies of Athens and as bitter enemies of the Corinthian colonies on their coast. The contact of those colonies, however, and the large spread of Akarnanian accessible coast, could not fail to produce some effect in socialising and improving the people. And it is probable that this effect would have been more sensibly felt, had not the Akarnanians been kept back by the fatal neighbourhood of the Ætolians, with whom they were in perpetual feud—a people the most unprincipled and unimprovable of all who bore the Hellenic name, and whose habitual faithlessness stood in marked contrast with the rectitude and steadfastness of the Akarnanian character.³ It was in order to strengthen the Akarnanians against these rapacious neighbours that the Macedonian Kassander urged them to consolidate their numerous small townships into a few considerable cities. Partially at least the recommendation was carried into effect, so as to aggrandise Stratus and one or two other towns. But in the succeeding century, the town of Leukas seems to lose its original position as a separate Corinthian colony, and to pass into that of

¹ Thucyd. ii. 102; iii. 105.

² Thucyd. ii. 68–102; Stephan. Byz. v. Φόλται. See the discussion in Strabo (x. p. 462), whether the Akarnanians did, or did not, take part in the expedition against Troy; Ephorus maintaining the negative, and stringing together a

plausible narrative to explain *why* they did not. The time came when the Akarnanians gained credit with Rome for this supposed absence of their ancestors.

³ Polyb. iv. 30: compare also ix. 40.

chief city of Akarnania,¹ which it lost only by the sentence of the Roman conquerors.

Passing over the borders of Akarnania, we find small nations or tribes not considered as Greeks, but known, from the fourth century B.C. downwards, under the common name of Epirots. This word signifies properly, inhabitants of a continent as opposed to those of an island or a peninsula. It came only gradually to be applied by the Greeks as their comprehensive denomination to designate all those diverse tribes, between the Ambrakian Gulf on the south and west, Pindus on the east, and the Illyrians and Macedonians to the north and north-east. Of these Epirots, the principal were—the Chaonians, Thesprotians, Kassôpians, and Molossians,² who occupied the country inland as well as maritime along the Ionian Sea from the Akroka-raunian mountains to the borders of Ambrakia in the interior of the Ambrakian Gulf. The Agræans and Amphilocheians dwelt eastward of the last-mentioned gulf, bordering upon Akarnania: the Athamânes, the Tymphæans, and the Talaes lived along the western skirts and high range of Pindus. Among these various tribes it is difficult to discriminate the semi-Hellenic from the non-Hellenic; for Herodotus considers both Molossians and Thesprotians as Hellenic—and the oracle of Dôdôna, as well as the Nekyomanteion (or holy cavern for evoking the dead) of Acheron, were both in the territory of the Thesprotians, and both (in the time of the historian) Hellenic. Thucydîdês, on the other hand, treats both Molossians and Thesprotians as barbaric, and Strabo says the same respecting the Athamânes, whom Plato numbers as Hellenic.³ As the Epirots were confounded with the Hellenic communities towards the south, so they become blended with the Macedonian and Illyrian tribes towards the north. The Macedonian Orestæ, north of the Cambunian mountains and east of Pindus, are called by Hekataëus a Molossian tribe; and Strabo even extends the designation Epirots to the Illyrian Paroræi and Atintânes, west of Pindus, nearly on the same parallel of latitude with the Orestæ.⁴

¹ Diodor. xix. 67; Livy xxxiii. 16–17; xlv. 31. ² Skylax, c. 28–32.

³ Herodot. ii. 56, v. 92, vi. 127; Thucyd. ii. 80; Plato, Minos, p. 315. The Chaonians and Thesprotians were separated by the river Thyamis (now Kalamas)—Thucyd. i. 46; Stephanus Byz. v. *Τροία*.

⁴ Hekataëus, Fr. 77, ed. Klausen; Strabo, vii. p. 326; Appian, Illyric. c. 7. In the time of Thucydîdês, the Mo-

lossi and the Atintânes were under the same king (ii. 80). The name Ἠπειρώται, with Thucydîdês, means only inhabitants of a continent—οἱ τὰντῆ ἡπειρῶται (i. 47; ii. 80) includes Ætolians and Akarnanians (iii. 94–95), and is applied to inhabitants of Thrace (iv. 105).

Epirus is used in its special sense to designate the territory west of Pindus, by Xenophon, Hellen. vi. 1, 7.

Compare Mannert, Geographie der

It must be remembered (as observed above), that while the designations Illyrians and Macedonians are properly ethnical, given to denote analogies of language, habits, feeling, and supposed origin, and probably acknowledged by the people themselves—the name Epirots belongs to the Greek language, is given by Greeks alone, and marks nothing except residence on a particular portion of the continent. Theopompus (about 340 B.C.) reckoned fourteen distinct Epirotic nations, among whom the Molossians and Chaonians were the principal. It is possible that some of these may have been semi-Illyrian, others semi-Macedonian, though all were comprised by him under the common name Epirots.¹

Of these various tribes, who dwelt between the Akrokeraunian promontory and the Ambrakian Gulf, some at least appear to have been of ethnical kindred with portions of the inhabitants of Southern Italy. There were Chaonians on the Gulf of Tarentum before the arrival of the Greek settlers, as well as in Epirus. Though we do not find the name Thesprotians in Italy, we find there a town named Pandosia and a river named Acheron, the same as among the Epirotic Thesprotians: the ubiquitous name Pelasgian is connected both with one and with the other. This ethnical affinity, remote or near, between CEnotrians and Epirots, which we must accept as a fact without being able to follow it into detail, consists at the same time with the circumstance—that both seem to have been susceptible of Hellenic influences to an unusual degree, and to have been moulded, with comparatively little difficulty, into an imperfect Hellenism, like that of the Ætolians and Akarnanians. The Thesprotian conquerors of Thessaly passed in this manner into Thessalian Greeks. The Amphilochians who inhabited Argos on the Ambrakian Gulf were hellenised by the reception of Greeks from Ambrakia, though the Amphilochians situated without the city still remained barbarous in the time of Thucydides:² a century afterwards, probably, they would be hellenised like the rest by a longer continuance of the same influences—as happened with the Sikels in Sicily.

To assign the names and exact boundaries of the different tribes inhabiting Epirus as they stood in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., at the time when the western stream of Grecian colonisation was going on, and when the newly-established Ambrakiots must have been engaged in sub-

Some of these tribes ethnically connected with those of Southern Italy.

Others, with the Macedonians—impossible to mark the boundaries.

Griech. und Römer, part vii. book 2. p. 283.

¹ Strabo, vii. p. 324.

² Thueyd. ii. 68.

jugating or expelling the prior occupants of their valuable site—is out of our power. We have no information prior to Herodotus and Thucydides, and that which they tell us cannot be safely applied to a time either much earlier or much later than their own. That there was great analogy between the inland Macedonians and the Epirots, from Mount Bermius across the continent to the coast opposite Korkyra, in military equipment, in the fashion of cutting the hair, and in speech, we are apprised by a valuable passage of Strabo; who farther tells us that many of the tribes spoke two different languages¹—a fact which at least proves very close inter-communion, if not a double origin and incorporation. Wars or voluntary secessions and new alliances would alter the boundaries and relative situation of the various tribes. And this would be the more easily effected, as all Epirus, even in the fourth century B.C., was parcelled out among an aggregate of villages, without any great central cities: so that the severance of a village from the Molossian union, and its junction with the Thesprotian (abstracting from the feelings with which it might be connected), would make little practical difference in its condition or proceedings. The gradual increase of Hellenic influence tended partially to centralise this political dispersion, enlarging some of the villages into small towns by the incorporation of some of their neighbours; and in this way probably were formed the seventy Epirotic cities which were destroyed and given up to plunder on the same day, by Paulus Emilius and the Roman senate. The Thesprotian Ephyre is called a city even by Thucydides.² Nevertheless the situation was unfavourable to the formation of considerable cities, either on the coast or in the interior, since the physical character of the territory is an exaggeration of that of Greece—almost throughout, wild, rugged and mountainous. The valleys and low grounds, though frequent, are never extensive—while the soil is rarely suited, in any continuous spaces, for the cultivation of corn; insomuch that the flour for the consumption of Janina, at the present day, is transported from Thessaly over the lofty ridge of Pindus by means of asses and mules;³ while the

Territory distributed into villages—no considerable cities.

¹ Strabo, vii. p. 324. In these same regions, under the Turkish government of the present day, such is the mixture and intercourse of Greeks, Albanians, Bulgaric Slavonians, Wallachians and Turks, that most of the natives find themselves under the necessity of acquiring two, sometimes three, languages; see Dr. Grisebach, *Reise durch*

Rumelien und nach Brussa, ch. xii. vol. ii. p. 68.

² Livy, xlv. 34; Thucyd. i. 47. Phanothé, in the more northerly part of Epirus, is called only a *castellum*, though it was an important military post (Livy, xliii. 21).

³ Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, ch. xxxviii. vol. iv. pp. 207, 210, 233;

fruits and vegetables are brought from Arta, the territory of Ambrakia. Epirus is essentially a pastoral country: its cattle as well as its shepherds and shepherd's dogs were celebrated throughout all antiquity; and its population then, as now, found divided village residence the most suitable to their means and occupations. In spite of this natural tendency, however, Hellenic influences were to a certain extent efficacious, and it is to them that we are to ascribe the formation of towns like Phœnikê—an inland city a few miles removed from the sea, in a latitude somewhat north of the northernmost point of Korkyra, which Polybius notices as the most flourishing¹ of the Epirotic cities at the time when it was plundered by the Illyrians in 230 B.C. Passarôn, the ancient spot where the Molossian kings were accustomed on their accession to take their coronation-oath, had grown into a considerable town, in this last century before the Roman conquest; while Tekmôn, Phylakê, and Horreum also become known to us at the same period.² But the most important step which those kings made towards aggrandisement, was the acquisition of the Greek city of Ambrakia, which became the capital of the kingdom of Pyrrhus, and thus gave to him the only site suitable for a concentrated population which the country afforded.

If we follow the coast of Epirus from the entrance of the Ambrakian Gulf northward to the Akrokeraunian promontory, we shall find it discouraging to Grecian colonisation. There are none of those extensive maritime plains which the Gulf of Tarentum exhibits on its coast, and which sustained the grandeur of Sybaris and Krôton. Throughout the whole extent, the mountain-region, abrupt and affording little cultivable soil, approaches near to the sea;³ and the level ground, wherever it exists, must be commanded and possessed (as it is now) by villagers on hill-sites, always difficult of attack and often inexpugnable. From hence, and from the neighbourhood of Korkyra—herself well situated for traffic with Epirus, and jealous of neighbouring rivals—we may understand why the Grecian emigrants omitted this unprofitable tract, and passed on either northward to the maritime plains of Illyria, or westward to Italy. In the time of Herodotus and Thucydîdês, there seems to have been no Hellenic settlement between Ambrakia and Apollonia. The harbour

Coast of
Epirus dis-
couraging to
Grecian colo-
nisation.

ch. ix. vol. i. p. 411; Cyprien Robert, *Les Slaves de Turquie*, book iv. ch. 2.

Βουβόται πρῶτες ἐξόχοι—Pindar, *Nem.* iv. 81; Cæsar, *Bell. Civil.* iii. 47.

¹ Polybius, ii. 5, 8.

² Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* c. i.; Livy, xlv. 26.

³ See the description of the geographical features of Epirus in Boué, *La Turquie en Europe*, *Géographie Générale*, vol. i. p. 57.

called Glykys Limên, with the neighbouring valley and plain, the most considerable in Epirus next to that of Ambrakia, near the junction of the lake and river of Acheron with the sea—were possessed by the Thesprotian town of Ephyrê, situated on a neighbouring eminence; perhaps also in part by the ancient Thesprotian town of Pandosia, so pointedly connected, both in Italy and Epirus, with the river Acheron.¹ Amidst the almost inexpugnable mountains and gorges which mark the course of that Thesprotian river, was situated the memorable recent community of Suli, which held in dependence many surrounding villages in the lower grounds and in the plain—the counterpart of primitive Epirotic rulers in situation, in fierceness, and in indolence, but far superior to them in energetic bravery and endurance. It appears that after the time of Thucydidês, certain Greek settlers must have found admission into the Epirotic towns in this region. For Dêmosthenês² mentions Pandosia, Buchetia, and Elæa, as settlements from Elis, which Philip of Macedon conquered and handed over to his brother-in-law the king of the Molossian Epirots; and Strabo tells us that the name of Ephyrê had been changed to Kichyrus, which appears to imply an accession of new inhabitants.

Both the Chaonians and Thesprotians appear, in the time of Thucydidês, as having no kings: there was a privileged kingly race, but the presiding chief was changed from year to year. The Molossians, however, had a line of kings, succeeding from father to son, which professed to trace its descent through fifteen generations downward, from Achilles and Neoptolemus to Tharypas about the year 400 B.C.: thus forming a scion of the great Æakid race. Admêtus, the Molossian king to whom Themistoklês presented himself as a suppliant, appears to have lived in the simplicity of an inland village chief. But Arrybas, his son or grandson, is said to have been educated at Athens, and to have introduced improved social regularity into his native country; while the subsequent kings both imitated the ambition and received the aid of Philip of Macedon, extending their domi-

Some Epirotic tribes governed by kings, others not.

¹ See the account of this territory in Colonel Leake's *Travels in Northern Greece*, vol. i. ch. v.; his journey from Janina, through the district of Suli and the course of the Acheron, to the plain of Glyky and the Acherusian lake and marshes near the sea. Compare also vol. iv. ch. xxxv. p. 73.

"To the ancient sites (observes Colonel Leake) which are so numerous in the great valleys watered by the Lower

Acheron, the Lower Thyamis, and their tributaries, it is a mortifying disappointment to the geographer not to be able to apply a single name with absolute certainty."

The number of these sites affords one among many presumptions that each must have been individually inconsiderable.

² Dêmosthenês, *De Haloneso*, ch. 7, p. 84 R; Strabo, vii. p. 324.

nion¹ over a large portion of the other Epirots. Even in the time of Skylax, they covered a large inland territory, though their portion of sea-coast was confined. From the narrative of Thucydidês, we gather that all the Epirots, though held together by no political union, were yet willing enough to combine for purposes of aggression and plunder. The Chaonians enjoyed a higher military reputation than the rest. But the account which Thucydidês gives of their expedition against Akarnania exhibits a blind, reckless, boastful impetuosity, which contrasts strikingly with the methodical and orderly march of their Greek allies and companions.²

To collect the few particulars known, respecting these ruder communities adjacent to Greece, is a task indispensable for the just comprehension of the Grecian world, and for the appreciation of the Greeks themselves by comparison or contrast with their contemporaries. Indispensable as it is, however, it can hardly be rendered in itself interesting to the reader, whose patience I have to bespeak by assuring him that the facts hereafter to be recounted of Grecian history would be only half understood without this preliminary survey of the lands around.

¹ Skylax, c. 32; Pausanias, i. 11; Justin, xvii. 6.

That the *Arrhybas* of Justin is the same as the *Thurypas* of Pausanias—perhaps also the same as *Tharyps* in

Thucydidês, who was a minor at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war—seems probable.

² Thucyd. ii. 81.

END OF VOL. II.

DOMINION: COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

DOMINION COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN JOSE,
SANTA CLAY COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL,
MARIN COUNTY
CALIFORNIA

180-196


19

180-219

5-12-563

290-354





DATE DUE

--	--

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY

DF214 .G9 v.2

Grote, Georg/A history of Greece



3 3645 00061149 4

DF214 .G76 1862

vol.2

Grote, George, 1794-1871.

A history of Greece : from
the earliest period to the
close of the generation
contemporary with Alexander

1478

Dominican College Library

San Rafael, California

